

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

CALL No.	938.005	J.H.S.
	Vol	58

D.G.A. 79.


THE JOURNAL OF
HELLENIC STUDIES

8.100.28
2428

THE JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES

VOLUME LVIII

1938



927.005
—
— . — . S.

PUBLISHED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE
PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES AND SOLD ON THEIR
BEHALF BY MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED, ST. MARTIN'S
STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

MDCCCXXXVIII

The Rights of Translation and Reproduction are Reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD.,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEWCASTLE.

Acc. No. 32966
Date. 14.12.57
Call No. 938.023
S. H. S.

CONTENTS

	PAGE	
List of Officers and Council	viii	
List of new Members and Student Associates	ix	
Meetings of the Session, 1937-38	xii	
Financial Statement	xv	
ASHMOLE (B.)	Manners and Methods in Archaeology	240
COSTELLO (D. P.)	Notes on the Athenian ΓΕΝΗ	171
GOW (A. S. F.)	The <i>Adoniazusae</i> of Theocritus	180
JACOBSTHAL (P.)	A Sybarite Himation	205
KNIGHT (W. F. J.)	Zeus in the <i>Prometheia</i>	51
ROBERTSON (C. M.)	A Group of Plastic Vases	41
WACE (A. J. B.)	The Chatsworth Head	90
WALBANK (F. W.)	ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ	55
WEST (A. B.) and WOODWARD (A. M.)	Studies in Attic Treasure-Records, II	69
WESTLAKE (H. D.)	Alcibiades, Agis and Spartan Policy	31
WOODWARD (A. M.)	See West (A. B.)	
WOOLLEY (C. L.)	Excavations at Al Mina, Sueidia, I-II	I, 133
YOUNG (G. M.)	Archaeology in Greece, 1937-38	217
ZANOTTI-BIANCO (U.)	Archaeological Discoveries in Sicily and Magna Graecia	247
Notes: BACHTIN (N.)	A Review of medieval and modern Greek	98
BARNETT (R. D.)	A Jewish Gold Medallion	255
HASPELS (C. H. E.) and URE (A. D.)	Attic Black-figured Lekythoi	256
MILLER (W.)	The Centenary of the Archaeological Society of Athens	254
MILNE (J. G.)	The Monetary Reform of Solon: a Correction	96
ROBERTSON (M.)	The Chatsworth Head	255
do.	A Group of Plastic Vases	255
THOMAS (H.)	An Inscription from Kythera	256
TOD (M. N.)	Notes on Attic Inventories	97
URE (A. D.)	See Haspels (C. H. E.)	
VAN HOORN (G.)	Anthesteria	99
Notices of Books		100, 260
Indexes		295

LIST OF PLATES

- I. Al Mina, Sueidia—The Mound and Sheikh's Tomb: Paved Room of Level 2.
- II. Al Mina, Sueidia—Drain and Pit in Level 2: Mud-brick Wall of Level 2.
- III. Al Mina, Sueidia—Stone Sarcophagus of Level 4: Bronze Door-fittings, Level 3.
- IV. Al Mina, Sueidia—Room filled with pointed Jars: Bin containing Lekythi, Level 3.
- V. Plastic Vases.
- VI. The Hekatompodon Record of 403 2 B.C. Front and Back.
- VII. The Hekatompodon Records of 402/1 and 401 0 B.C.
- VIII. The Chatsworth Apollo. Front and Side Views.
- IX. The Chatsworth Apollo. Details.

- X. Al Mina, Sueidia—Terra-cottas.
- XI. Al Mina, Sueidia—Terra-cottas.
- XII. Al Mina, Sueidia—Limestone and Marble Figures.
- XIII. Al Mina, Sueidia—Bone and other Objects.
- XIV. Al Mina, Sueidia—Amulets.
- XV. Al Mina, Sueidia—Seals and Scarabs.
- XVI. Hellenistic Relief in Munich.
- XVII. Terracotta Erotes in Boston.
- XVIII. Archaic Poros Head of Herakles from North Slope of Acropolis.
- XIX. Protocorinthian Oenochoe and Bronze Horse from Ithaca.
- XX. Coins of Sicily.
- XXI. Coins of Aetna and Naxos, and a modern Pastiche.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT

Excavations at al Mina, Sueidia

	PAGE
Fig. 1. Mt. Kasios from the Mouth of the Orontes	I
„ 2. Map indicating Area excavated	6
„ 3. Reconstruction of a Warehouse	14
„ 4. Plan of the reconstructed Warehouse	15
„ 5. Cypriote Krater with design of Bulls	17
„ 6. Cypriote Terra-cottas, Level 4	19
„ 7. Cypriote Temple Boy, Level 4	21
„ 8. Attic Aryballi found in Room F6, Level 3	23
„ 9. Gold and Electrum Necklace, Level 3	25
„ 10. Local Krater, Level 3	25
„ 11. Local Lekythi, Level 3	27
„ 12. Marble Head of City Goddess, Level 2	27
„ 13. Drain Pipes	135
„ 14. Carved Limestone Fragment	135
„ 15. Types of Lamps	138
„ 16. Bronze Fittings for Furniture	138
„ 17. Types of Fibulae	138
„ 18. Bronze Vessels	138
„ 19. Alabaster Vase Types	141
„ 20. Inscriptions	145
„ 21. Terra-cotta Figurine	145
„ 22. Bronze Objects	145
„ 23. Silver Bracelet, MN. 47	145
„ 24. Bronze Weight, MN. 235	145
„ 25. Metal Tools, etc.	147
„ 26. Clay Vase Types	149
„ 27. Clay Vase Types	151
„ 28. Clay Vase and Terra-cotta Types	153

A Group of Plastic Vases

Fig. 1. <i>a.</i> Berlin 1340: <i>b.</i> Boston 518: <i>c.</i> Boston 517	43
„ 2. British Museum: Aidoion vase	43
„ 3. Würzburg 150	47

Studies in Attic Treasure-Records II

	PAGE
Fig. 1. <i>IG</i> II ² , 1399 and 1373	71
„ 2. <i>IG</i> II ² , 1503, with new Fragment on left	81
„ 3. <i>IG</i> II ² , 1390	87

The Chatsworth Head

Fig. 1. The Right Ear	93
------------------------------	----

The *Adoniazusae* of Theocritus

Fig. 1. Terracottas in the British Museum	185
„ 2. Chinese Rain Hat	188
„ 3. Plan of Ancient Alexandria	192
„ 4. From an Apulian Amphora in Naples	195
„ 5. Ganymede Group in the Vatican	197
„ 6. Fresco from Pompeii	199
„ 7. Hellenistic Relief in the British Museum	201

A Sybarite Himation

Fig. 1. Etruscan Pictured Garment from the François Tomb	207
„ 2. Kerch Pelike in Leningrad—the Kypria	210
„ 3. Attic Fourth-century Psephisma Relief	211
„ 4. Town Pictures from Pinara	213
„ 5. Mosaic with Crenellated Border	213

Archaeology in Greece, 1937-1938

Fig. 1. Athens: Plan of Agora	218
„ 2. Kerameikos: Excavations	220
„ 3. Kerameikos: Protogeometric Pyxis	220
„ 4. Kerameikos: Poros Stele	220
„ 5. Olympia: Bronze Shields	223
„ 6. Ithaca: Bronze Goat on Spout	226
„ 7. Olynthus: House	228
„ 8. Olynthus: Bronze Shield-rim	228
„ 9. Samos: Bronze Statuette	230
„ 10. Gems from Siphnos	232
„ 11. Pottery Figurine from Kolonna	235
„ 12. Karphi: Painted Clay Altar and Vases	235
„ 13. Khirokitia: Neolithic Settlement	237

Archaeological Discoveries in Sicily and Magna Graecia

Fig. 1. Syracuse: Temple of Apollo	248
„ 2. Xoana from Palma Montechiaro	248
„ 3. The Heraeum: Aerial View	252
„ 4. The Heraeum: Archaic Metope	252
„ 5. The Heraeum: Anta Capitals from the Thesauros	252

A Jewish Gold Medallion

Fig. 1. Jewish Gold Medallion	256
--------------------------------------	-----

An Inscription from Kythera

Fig. 2. Stone with Minoan Script	256
-----------------------------------------	-----

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL FOR 1938—1939.

President.

SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, D.Litt., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents.

The following *ex-Presidents* :

SIR ARTHUR EVANS, F.R.S., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., 1910-14.
SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., F.B.A., 1920-24.
MR. ARTHUR HAMILTON SMITH, C.B., F.B.A., 1924-29.
PROF. ERNEST GARDNER, Litt.D., 1929-32.
PROF. R. M. DAWKINS, F.B.A., 1932-35.
PROF. J. L. MYRES, O.B.E., D.Litt., D.Sc., F.B.A., 1935-38.

and

PROF. F. E. ADCOCK, D.Litt., F.B.A.	SIR H. STUART JONES, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROF. B. ASHMOLE, F.B.A.	DR. J. G. MILNE
PROF. N. H. BAYNES, D.D., F.B.A.	PROF. GILBERT MURRAY, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROF. J. D. BEAZLEY, Litt.D., F.B.A.	SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.
DR. H. I. BELL, C.B., O.B.E., F.B.A.	PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, F.B.A.
DR. W. H. BUCKLER, F.B.A.	DR. J. T. SHEPPARD.
DR. A. W. PICKARD CAMBRIDGE, F.B.A.	MRS. ARTHUR STRONG, C.B.E., Litt.D.
SIR JOHN FORSDYKE, K.C.B.	DR. W. W. TARN, F.B.A.
SIR J. G. FRAZER, O.M., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.	PROF. A. J. B. WACE.
SIR G. F. HILL, K.C.B., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.	

Council.

Elected, 1936.	Elected, 1937.	Elected, 1938.
MR. M. P. CHARLESWORTH.	MISS M. ALFORD.	MR. A. ANDREWES
MR. R. H. DUNDAS.	MR. R. P. AUSTIN.	MR. R. D. BARNETT.
LADY EVANS.	MISS J. R. BACON.	LADY BROOKE.
DR. JOAN EVANS	MR. C. M. BOWRA.	MR. R. M. COOK.
MR. R. J. H. JENKINS.	PROF. F. R. EARP.	MISS M. HARTLEY.
DR. C. M. KNIGHT.	MR. B. L. HALLWARD.	MR. C. M. ROBERTSON.
MR. H. C. OAKLEY.	MR. N. G. L. HAMMOND.	MR. T. C. SKEAT.
PROF. H. A. ORMEROD.	MR. R. P. HINKS.	MR. G. A. D. TAIT.
MR. F. N. PRYCE.	PROF. H. M. LAST.	MR. A. D. TRENDALL.
MR. E. S. G. ROBINSON.	PROF. F. H. MARSHALL.	MR. A. M. WOODWARD
MR. A. P. SINKER.	MR. L. P. WILKINSON.	

Standing Committee.

THE PRESIDENT.	DR. H. I. BELL.	} Elected by the Council.
THE HON. TREASURER.	SIR GEORGE HILL.	
THE HON. SECRETARY.	PROF. F. H. MARSHALL.	
THE EDITOR.		

Acting Editorial Committee.

MR. A. D. TRENDALL. | PROF. M. CARY. | MR. A. S. F. GOW.

Consultative Editorial Committee.

SIR GEORGE HILL. | PROF. GILBERT MURRAY. | SIR FREDERIC KENYON.
MR. G. M. YOUNG, C.I.E., *ex officio* as Director of the British School at Athens.

Trustees.

SIR FREDERIC KENYON. | PROF. F. E. ADCOCK. | MR. M. S. THOMPSON.

Hon. Treasurer.

MR. M. S. THOMPSON.

Hon. Secretary.

SIR JOHN FORSDYKE, K.C.B.

Auditors.

MR. C. F. CLAY,
MR. W. E. F. MACMILLAN.

Bankers.

MESSRS. COUTTS & CO.,
15 LOMBARD STREET, E.C.3.

Assistant Secretary, Librarian and Keeper of Photographic Collections.

MR. W. T. PURDON, 50 BEDFORD SQUARE, W.C.1.

Library Clerk.

MR. G. WISE.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Elected during the year 1938 only.

† *Life Members.*

- Bartlett, Miss R. M., 28, *Hart Grove, Ealing, W.* 5.
 Beachcroft, Miss M., *High Row, Felixstowe College, Felixstowe, Suffolk.*
 Bloesch, H., *Bonstettenstrasse 16, Berne, Switzerland.*
 Bowes, A. J. L., 15, *Queens Gardens, Herne Bay, Kent.*
 †Brown, A. E., "Brooklyn," 339, *Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge.*
 Buxton, E. J. M., *Remenham, Wilmslow, Cheshire.*
 Cartwright, R. F. W., *Aynho Park, Aynho, Banbury, Oxon.*
 Crosby, Miss M., *American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.*
 Cumbers, E. W., 5, *The Glade, Ewell, Surrey.*
 Dalton, P. G. F., 1, *Woodchurch Road, N.W.* 6.
 Duggan, M., *Ottoville, Tramore, Co. Waterford.*
 Edwards, R. E., 1, *Arnold Road, Southampton.*
 Forsey, J. M., *Hosey School, Westerham, Kent.*
 Gilling, R. W. N. B., *The Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.* 2.
 Grant, M., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Hankey, T., 2, *Belbroughton Road, Oxford.*
 Holloway, Miss H. M., 14, *Highwood Avenue, North Finchley, N.* 12.
 Hunt, D. W. S., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
 Jasper, L. D., 15, *Overbury Avenue, Beckenham, Kent.*
 Jeffery, Miss L. H., *Eastnor, Sydenham Villas Road, Cheltenham, Glos.*
 Johnson, Miss T. O. B., *Salaam, West Lodge Avenue, W.* 3.
 Jones, F. W. O., *New College, Oxford.*
 Kemp, J. N., 83, *Cromwell Road South, Whitstable, Kent.*
 Labram, G. W., 74, *Kilmartin Ave., Norbury, S.W.* 16.
 McIntosh, A. J., 117, *Brownlow Road, New Southgate, N.* 11.
 Mann, Miss C. W., 39, *Esmond Gardens, Bedford Park, W.* 4.
 Martienssen, R., c/o Stanley Casson Esq., *New College, Oxford.*
 Martin, V. C., *The Foxhills, Wombourne, Wolverhampton.*
 Martinij, Dr. G., 31, *Bedford Way, W.C.* 1.
 Mason, P. G., *Christowe, Cheltenham.*
 Monk, R. I., *Quernmore School, Bromley, Kent.*
 Mullens, H. G., *King Williams College, Castletown, Isle of Man.*
 Murray, H. P. W., *Bramble Hill Lodge, Nr. Lyndhurst, Hants.*
 Oliver, Prof. J. H., 435, *West 119th Street, New York City, U.S.A.*
 Pascoe, Miss M., *Bracken Hill, Woking, Surrey.*
 Pendleton, Rev. M. B., 78, *Athelstan Road, Clive Vale, Hastings.*
 Philippou, L., *P.O. Box 22, Paphos, Cyprus.*
 †Platnauer, M., *Brasenose College, Oxford.*
 Pollard, J. R. T., *The Woodstock Hotel, Canterbury Road, Herne Bay.*
 Rich, Miss O. M., *Rivington, Beaulieu Gardens, N.* 21.
 Rodewald, C. A., *New College, Oxford (Rosemount, Ryde, Isle of Wight).*
 Rowling, Mrs. M. A., *Cliffside, Kendal, Westmorland.*
 Salmon, C., 7, *Manor Road, Romford, Essex.*
 Syme, R., *Trinity College, Oxford.*
 Taber, Miss A. L., 4, *Woodland Way, Shirley, Croydon.*
 Tierney, J. J., *Dept. of Ancient Classics, University College, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin.*
 Tredegar, Right Hon. The Viscount, *Tredegar Park, Newport, Monmouthshire.*
 Waddy, L. H., *Marlborough College, Wilts* 92. *York Mansions, Battersea Park, S.W.* 11).
 Warwick, P. P., 1, *The Orchard, Blackheath, S.E.* 3.
 Way, R. E., *Grey Home, Brinkley, N. Newmarket.*
 Williams, R. Allport, 1, *Vendrum Buildings, Grays Inn, W.C.* 1.
 Wood, Miss C. D., 9, *Lucerne Road, Orpington, Kent.*
 Wootton, R. W. F., *Lattergate, Kings School, Canterbury.*

STUDENT ASSOCIATES.

Elected during the year 1938 only.

- Argenti, C., *Trinity College, Oxford* (60, *Porchester Terrace, W.* 2).
- Ashley, J. B., *Balliol College, Oxford*.
- Balfour-Paul, H. G., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (*Cakemuir, Tynehead, Midlothian*).
- Ball-Greene, B., *Clare College, Cambridge* (*Littlewood, West Byfleet, Surrey*).
- Barnes, E. J. W., *Trinity College, Cambridge* (*Bishop's Croft, Harborne, Birmingham*).
- Bell, Miss A., *King's College, Strand* (*Lavington, Avenue Road, St. Albans, Herts.*).
- Bookless, J. G., *Clare College, Cambridge* (45, *Coombe Road, Croydon*).
- Brabazon, Miss F. M., *Fassaroe, Bray, Co. Wicklow, Ireland*.
- Bramley, Miss F., *St. Hugh's College, Oxford* (284, *Stanstead Road, S.E.* 23).
- Brotherton-Ratcliffe, G., *Balliol College, Oxford* (*The Tower, Kenley, Surrey*).
- Browning, R., *Balliol College, Oxford* (*Holywell Manor, Oxford*).
- Buchanan, A., *Balliol College, Oxford* (13, *Dunlop St., Greenock, Renfrewshire*).
- Caird, G. B., *Peterhouse, Cambridge* (46, *School Road, Moseley, Birmingham*, 13).
- Castellain, G. C., *Christ Church, Oxford* (3, *Little Dean's Yard, S.W.* 1).
- Childs, E. L., 30, *Coram Street, W.C.* 1.
- Cox, S. E., *Queen Mary College* (6, *Oakbury Road, Wandsworth Bridge Road, Fulham, S.W.* 6).
- Davin, D. M., *Balliol College, Oxford* (20, *Blenheim Gardens, Willesden Green, N.W.* 2).
- Dettmann, Miss D., *Somerville College, Oxford*.
- Dixon, H. P., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (37, *Cavendish Road, Bournemouth*).
- Doherty, H. A., *University College, W.C.* 1 (46, *Duncan Terrace, N.* 1).
- Edelston, M. P., *Queen Mary College* (66, *Granville Road, Southfields, S.W.* 18).
- Elton, M. C., *Pembroke College, Oxford* (9, *Hollycroft Avenue, Hampstead, N.W.* 3).
- Fairlie, J., *Corpus Christi College, Oxford* (15, *Cranley Gardens, N.* 10).
- Fenwick, J. H., *University College, W.C.* 1 (*Westminster Training College, 130, Horseferry Road, S.W.* 1).
- Fisher, Miss V. M., *Stilton Rectory, Peterborough*.
- Fraser, P. M., *Brasenose College, Oxford* (227, *Sheen Lane, East Sheen, S.W.* 14).
- Gaul, J. H., *Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.* (48, *Bernard Street, Russell Square, W.C.* 1).
- Gorton, L. J., *Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (*The Orchards, Innsworth Road, Gloucester*).
- Graham, J., *Trinity College, Cambridge* (10, *Howard Street, Kilmarnock*).
- Gutch, M., *Peterhouse, Cambridge* (*St. Denys Lodge, Warminster, Wilts.*).
- Harcourt, Miss P. N., *Society of Oxford Home Students* (64, *Woodstock Road, Oxford*).
- Harrison, F. A. K., *New College, Oxford* (*Overdene, Busbridge Lane, Godalming, Surrey*).
- Hart-Synnot, A. R. P., *Christ Church, Oxford* (16, *Wythburn Court, Seymour Place, W.* 1).
- Hayles, H. R., *Peterhouse, Cambridge* (8, *Earl's Terrace, Kensington, W.* 8).
- Higgins, R. A., *Sheerlands, Newhaw, Weybridge, Surrey*.
- Hill, P. V., 18, *Willoughby Road, Hampstead, N.W.* 3.
- Holmes, G. R., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (36, *Rawlins Street, Liverpool* 7).
- Hope-Nicholson, Miss L., *Courtauld Institute of Art, W.* 1 (18, *First Street, Chelsea, S.W.* 3).
- Instone, R., *Christ Church, Oxford* (11, *Camden Hill Gardens, W.* 8).
- Johnson, W. H. B., *Bewdley, Newhaw, Weybridge*.
- Kemp, A. S. H., *Christ Church, Oxford* (41, *Langley Park Road, Sutton, Surrey*).
- Kerr, Miss M., *Westfield College, N.W.* 3 (12, *Whiteley Wood Road, Sheffield*, 11).
- Knowles, S. F., *Binkbeck College, E.C.* 4 (18, *Carew Road, Wallington, Surrey*).
- Kraay, C., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (26, *Burgess Hill, N.W.* 2).
- Larter, Miss J., 11, *Ravenscourt Square, W.* 6.
- Law, R. H., 47, *Meadowhouse Road, Corstorphine, Edinburgh*.
- Lee, J. S. G., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (61, *High Street, Oxford*).
- Letchford, P., *St. Peter's Hall, Oxford* (17, *Argyle Road, Sevenoaks, Kent*).
- Macdiarmid, N. C., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (*Westbrook Hay, Boxmoor, Herts.*).

- Mackrill, I. R., *Clare College, Cambridge* (Lamwath Hall, Sutton-on-Hull, E. Yorks.).
 McPherson, G. O. G., *University College, W.C. 1* (c. o London House, Gulsford Street, W.C. 1).
 Matthaei, A. R. L., *Trinity Hall, Cambridge* (27, Emmerdale Road, Kew Gardens, Surrey).
 Minards, R. M. K., *Brasenose College, Oxford* (Tudor Cottage, Bedhampton Hill, Havant).
 Murray, Miss G., *St. Hugh's College, Oxford* (318, Birch Lane, Dukinfield, Cheshire).
 Parkes, W., *Clare College, Cambridge* (20, Langbourne Avenue, Highgate, N. 6).
 Pearson, G. L., *Clare College, Cambridge* (c. o Mrs. Robertson, Alvey, Newtonmore, Inverness-shire).
 Penty, R. H., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (59, Church Street, Isleworth, Middlesex).
 Pitts-Tucker, M. W., *Clare College, Cambridge* (Elm Croft, Gloucester Road, Kingston Hill, Surrey).
 Pridmore, Miss S. C., *St. Hugh's College, Oxford*.
 Rendall, H. A., *Christ Church, Oxford* (49, Catherine Place, S.W. 1).
 Sadleir, F. G., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (Coffinswell Parsonage, Newton Abbot, Devon).
 Scott-Malden, C. P., *King's College, Cambridge* (Downs Lodge, Sutton, Surrey).
 Sharp, R. L., *Clare College, Cambridge* (45, Gray Street, Aberdeen).
 Spilsbury, R. J., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (31, Marlborough Hill, N.W. 8).
 Stenner, Miss G. D., *Westfield College, N.W. 3* (5, Norman Way, W. 3).
 Stoakes, F., *Merton College, Oxford* (110, Baffins Road, Portsmouth, Hants.).
 Tite, K., *Magdalen College, Oxford* (79, Little Glen Road, Blaby, Leicester).
 Walker, C. C., 2, *Banavie Court, The Avenue, Beckenham, Kent*.
 Webb, G. H. D., *University College, W.C. 1* (97, Deodar Road, Putney, S.W. 15).
 Weiler, T. G. P., *University College, W.C. 1* (53, Park Hill, S.W. 4).
 Wheeler, H. A., *Trinity Hall, Cambridge* (9, Rostrevor Terrace, Rathgar, Dublin).
 Widdows, P. F., *Hertford College, Oxford* (6, Campden Hill Square, W. 8).
 Williamson, A. F., *Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (5, Eynella Road, East Dulwich, S.E. 22).
 Williamson, Miss I., *Westfield College, N.W. 3* (25, Normanton Drive, Mansfield, Notts.).

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES.

Enrolled during the year 1938 only.

- CAGLIARI, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, *R. Università degli Studi, Cagliari, Sardinia*.
 CAIRO, Egyptian Library, *Midan Bab El Khalq, Cairo, Egypt*.
 COLOMBO, University College Library, *Colombo, Ceylon*.
 DURHAM, St. Mary's College, *Durham*.
 KENT, State University Library, *Kent, Ohio, U.S.A.*
 MADISON, Drew University Library, *Madison, New Jersey, U.S.A.*
 MORGANTOWN, West Virginia University Library, *Morgantown, W. Virginia, U.S.A.*
 OXFORD, Trinity College Library, *Oxford*.
 OXFORD, Western College Library, *Oxford, Ohio, U.S.A.*
 ROME, R. Istituto d'archeologia e storia dell' Arte, *Piazza Venezia 3, Roma (1), Italy*.
 SUPERIOR, State Teachers College Library, *Superior, Wisconsin, U.S.A.*

MEETINGS

OF THE SESSION 1937-38

1 At the inaugural Meeting of the Session, held on November 2nd, 1937, Prof. J. Enoch Powell read a paper on 'Herodotus in the Making.' He maintained that the *logoi* on Assyria, Egypt, Scythia and Libya were never 'monographs,' but were written as integral parts of the history of the Persian empire: the story of the Ionian revolt, of Marathon and of the invasion of Xerxes was never an independent work, but was composed after the history of Persia and designed to follow it in the same work. The history of Persia, on the other hand, was at one time an end in itself, and when later Herodotus conceived the idea of embodying it in a history of the Persian wars, he subjected it to a severe and somewhat hasty remodelling, of which numerous traces were still discoverable.

Thus Herodotus was responsible for two stages in the rise of history, for in his history of Persia he combined ethno-geographical treatment of the several nations with the description of a historical process, and in his history of the Persian Wars he shifted the centre of historiographical interest from the remote past of the Orient to the recent past of Greece.

In order to illustrate these points, the lecturer had prepared a scheme * of the 'Persica,' which was in the hands of the audience.

A vote of thanks was proposed by Mr. A. W. Gomme, and seconded by Mr. C. Hardie, and the meeting concluded with observations by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, who kindly acted as Chairman in the absence of the President.

2 A special meeting of the Society was held on November 23rd, 1937, when Prof. C. F. A.

Schaeffer, Director of the French Archaeological Expedition to Ras Shamra and Deputy Keeper of the Musée des Antiquités Nationales de France, read a paper on 'Ras Shamra and the Aegean and Mycenaean World.' In his communication, which was illustrated by lantern slides, Prof. Schaeffer explained that the latest archaeological discoveries had shown the importance which should be attached to the oriental factor in Aegean civilisation: for Ugarit, the capital of a kingdom of the same name, discovered by the French Archaeological Expedition on the hill called Ras Shamra 170 miles north of Beirut, was situated on the shortest trade route between the oriental world and the Aegean and was the best port on the Syrian coast.

Since the first expansion of Cretan trade, at the beginning of the second millennium, Minoan products were imported to Ras Shamra-Ugarit, where vases of Kamares type, of the Middle Minoan II period, had been found. As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century B.C. 'Aegeans' had emigrated to Ugarit, and had soon formed a regular colony in this Syrian port. During the great movements of population in the seventeenth century, ending in the establishment of the Hyksos dynasty in Egypt, the commercial relations between Syria and the Aegean world were suspended. But the Aegean settlers at Ugarit were attached to their traditions, and were compelled to use imitations to supply the demand for the original Cretan products which they had hitherto obtained by importation. In their tombs discovered at Ras Shamra-Ugarit

* The 'Persica' of Herodotus, ca. 445 B.C.

Subject.	Corresponding chapters of the later work.
The Medes: Astyages: Cyrus and the rise of Persia	1. 95. 2 - 1. 130. 2.
Description of Persia: Persian customs	1. 131-140 - .
The Lydian empire: its conquest by Persia: description	1. 6-94 in earlier form.
Ionia: its conquest by Persia	1. 141-176.
Babylon: its conquest by Persia	1. 177-191.
The Massagetae: their invasion by Persia	1. 201-216.
Description and history of Egypt (<i>Aegyptiakos logos</i>): its conquest by Persia	2. 1-3. 38.
The magi: the conspirators: the Persian empire under Darius	3. 61-119.
The revolt and fall of Babylon: history and description (<i>Assyrioi logoi</i>)	3. 150-160: 1.192-200 - .
Description of Scythia (<i>Scythikos logos</i>): its invasion by Persia	4. 1-142.
Description of Libya (<i>Libykoi logoi</i>): its invasion by Persia	4. 145-205.

there had been found copies of Cretan vases of the Middle Minoan type; architecturally, also, these tombs exhibited Aegean influence no less clearly.

The first Mycenaean products (certain types of bronze weapons) reached Ras Shamra-Ugarit in the sixteenth century B.C., probably through intermediate Cretan trade channels. But the relations between the Aegean World and North Syria did not return to normal until towards the end of the fifteenth century, when Egypt resumed her rôle of powerful guardian of the coasts of Syria and Palestine and restored order and peace there.

In the fourteenth century the influence of the then decadent Cretan civilisation was displaced by that of Mycenae, which, however, did not succeed in effacing the still-vigorous Minoan traditions of Ugarit. The large rich tombs of the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries at Ras Shamra-Ugarit disclosed in the architecture of their corbelled roofs funerary traditions which are Aegean rather than Mycenaean: the best parallels were certain tombs of the Zafer Papoura necropolis in Crete. It was Cretan art above all which, along with Egyptian art, inspired artists and workmen at Ugarit. A great number of them must have been of Aegean origin: the style of certain ivory, gold and bronze objects discovered at Ras Shamra proved this. On the other hand, they could not escape the influence of the oriental surroundings in which they lived. And so it happened that they produced a composite art which might be termed Syro-Minoan and Syro-Mycenaean. Egyptian frescoes of the time of the eighteenth Dynasty showed objects of this kind which certain Keftians in conjunction with the Syrian envoys of Retenu bring as gifts to Pharaoh. These Keftians, whose origin has been for so long disputed, were without doubt Cretan settlers from the Aegean colonies on the Syrian coast like that which has been discovered at Ras Shamra-Ugarit. They must have paid for the privilege of trading in the Egean zone of influence by annual tribute to the Pharaohs.

In spite of the Hittite menace which hung over North Syria, the Aegeo-Mycenaean colony of Ras Shamra-Ugarit continued its development during the second half of the fourteenth and in the thirteenth centuries. The town and all the coastal region to the south of Ugarit escaped the Hittite conquest. This final result constituted a distinct success for the diplomatic attitude of the two Amenophis whose motives had been until now misunderstood by historians. On the other hand, it was not impossible that the prudent policy of the Hittite kings towards

Ugarit was inspired by their desire to respect Mycenaean interests there. This would support the hypothesis of those who maintained that the Mycenaean hegemony in the Eastern Mediterranean had a political reality.

The invasion of the Peoples of the Sea and of the North at the beginning of the twelfth century destroyed Ugarit and its Aegeo-Mycenaean colony. It was thus Europeans who, in their blindness, annihilated the prestige which Western civilisation had won for the first time in the Ancient Orient.

After observations by Mr. J. D. S. Pendlebury, a vote of thanks was proposed by Sir John Forsdyke and endorsed with acclamation.

At the Second General Meeting, held on 3 February 1st, 1938, Mr. A. W. Gomme read a paper on 'Aristophanes and Politics,' in which he combated the view that Aristophanes consistently used the theatre for practical ends, to attack movements or persons he disliked and to defend what he admired, and was a conservative, an ardent admirer of the older generations, and especially of the farmer class. He maintained that such a view led to contradictions, and that Aristophanes should be judged not as a practical politician, but as a dramatist: that the question to be asked was not, 'What were his opinions?' but 'Is his picture of Athens at different periods a convincing one?' When the poet was clearly stating his own opinions, as in some of the parabases in which he addresses the audience directly, he generally speaks not of politics but of his art; and in art he claimed that, so far from being a conservative, he was a revolutionary, always inventing novel ideas, and had raised comedy above the rustic buffoonery with which his rivals were content. Whether he was a conservative or not in politics was not known, and, compared with his claims as an artist the question was unimportant, since he was a dramatist, not a politician.

A vote of thanks was proposed from the Chair and seconded by Dr. Bell, who expressed the thanks of the audience to Prof. Adcock for taking the Chair in the President's absence.

The Third General Meeting was held on May 4 3rd, 1938, when Mr. R. M. Cook read a paper with slide-illustrations on 'The Date of the Hesiodic "Shield."' He had argued, in a paper published in *The Classical Quarterly*, xxxi, 204 ff., that while parts of the description of Herakles' shield were based on the Homeric 'Shield of Achilles' both in subject and in phrasing, most of the other parts had parallels, sometimes very close, in archaic art. It was unlikely that the author of the poem, elsewhere thoroughly imitative, in these parts diverged into

originality: the reasonable conclusion was that he was following artistic models. On examining the periods during which these artistic models were common on vases—and vases were to be regarded as fairly representative of archaic pictorial art—it appeared that the time when all the required models were to be found was the decade 580–70, and the schools Attic and Corinthian. The ‘Shield’ would hardly have been composed much later than 570, since in the sixth century archaism was not strong. These results agreed with the view based on historical and literary arguments, perhaps inadequate, that the poem was written about 575 by a Boeotian or Thessalian. There was no evidence of the influence of Ionia, nor yet of Chalcis, whose art was not yet known to archaeologists. Studniczka’s article *Ueber den Schild des Herakles*, in *Serta Harteliana*, 1896, had endeavoured to prove that the shield which ‘Hesiod’ was describing was a real shield: but there was no positive evidence for Studniczka’s theory; he had had to manipulate the text, and the technique and elaborate decoration of Herakles’ shield were alien to what was known of archaic Greek art. The more natural solution was that the poet had simply set out to emulate the shield of Achilles, and had varied Homeric scenes with familiar subjects of the art of his own time.

After observations by Prof. Earp, a vote of thanks was moved by the President from the Chair.

- 5 At the Annual Meeting of the Society, held on June 28th, 1938, the President, Prof. J. L. Myres, occupied the Chair. In moving the adoption of the Annual Report, the President called attention to the losses the Society had sustained and the need for increasing its membership; he paid tribute to the work of Mr. F. N. Pryce, the retiring Editor of the *Journal*, who would be succeeded by Mr. A. D. Trendall; he pointed out that the Accounts showed that the financial position of the Society was on the whole satisfactory. The motion was seconded by Mr. R. P. Austin, and on being put to the meeting was carried unanimously.

The motion for the election of Sir Richard Livingstone as President was proposed by Sir Frederic Kenyon and seconded by Mr. H. C. Oakley: it was carried unanimously.

The motion for the election and re-election of the Vice-Presidents, Members of Council and Auditors as detailed in the Annual Report was moved by Sir John Forsdyke and seconded by Miss Bacon: it was carried unanimously.

The retiring President, Prof. J. L. Myres, then delivered his Address, the subject of which was

‘Pre-Socratic History.’ He suggested that the place of Clio among the Nine Muses of Hesiod illustrated the Greek conception of history as the celebration of ‘men’s deeds’ κλέα ἀνδρῶν and its close relation to Epic, whose guardian, Calliope, was also the source of ‘fair speech’ in general, inspiring kings as well as bards. Herodotus set out to save ‘men’s deeds’ from oblivion; but his scope was wider than Hellenic, and he inquired also into ‘causes.’

The Three Muses of Helicon—Mneme, Melete, Aoide—illustrated similarly the relation of nascent History in Greece to Science and to Drama, no less than to Epic. It was Herodotus’ skill in ‘putting facts together’ as a dramatist selected and composed his plot, rather than deliberate inventiveness, that had provoked Thucydides’ criticism of ‘tendencious’ (not ‘fabulous’) predecessors. This allusive style, and subtle grouping of episodes to enhance major themes and crises, had been mistaken for garrulity and untidiness, but on investigation was found to be deliberate and methodical technique, and brought the literary skill of Herodotus into close intimacy with that of Attic dramatists, and especially of Sophocles.

Since Herodotus was the only pre-Socratic writer, besides the dramatists, whose work was preserved in full, comparison with contemporary investigators of Nature and Man could not be minute or detailed; especially as in the early days of any study, vocabulary was personal and unconventional, drawing direct from common speech, using ‘rather poetical terms,’ as was said of Anaximenes, and especially political and moral phrases with physical and biological meanings. Examples were the use, by Herodotus and the Ionian physicists, of τίσις, ἀρχή, μοῖρα, τύχη, and especially of αἰτία; the last named was never used by Herodotus except of human, deliberate, and responsible initiative. Thus alongside as determinist metaphysic of ‘fate’ and ‘predestined’ causation, and a popular heritage of ‘gods and heroes’ from Olympian polytheism, Herodotus emphasised, at every crisis, the free choice of leading personages, as the ‘reason why’ events had occurred as they did. Typical instances were the decision of the polemarch Callimachus at Marathon, and that of the Athenians to follow the lead of Themistocles, which decided the issue of the struggle with Persia.

A vote of thanks to the President for his Address and for his services to the Society during his tenure of office was proposed by Prof. N. H. Baynes, and was endorsed with acclamation. The proceedings concluded with a brief acknowledgement by Prof. Myres.

BALANCE SHEET. DECEMBER 31, 1937.

	Liabilities.			Assets.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To Debts Payable.....			690	0	11	
" Subscriptions paid in advance			116	11	0	
" Endowment Fund			2039	12	0	
(includes legacy of £180 from the late Prof. P. Gardner, £200 from the late Canon Adam Farrar, £200 from the late Rev. H. F. Tozer, and £500 from the late Mr. G. A. Macmillan)						
Life Compositions and Donations— Total at Jan 1, 1937		2272	4	0		
Less Donations transferred to-wards Current Expenses	4	4	0			
Received during year	2268	0	0			
Less carried to Income and Expenditure Account—Members deceased	2325	15	0			
Surplus at January 1, 1937			312	13	2½	
Add Balance from Income and Expenditure Account	314	7	7½			
Surplus at December 31, 1937			627	0	10	
						£5762 4 9
By Cash in Hand—Bank						
Assistant Treasurer				333	13	9
Petty Cash				11	2	6
Debts Receivable				115	5	0
Investments						460 1 3
Library Premises Capital Account—Amount spent to date						153 1 0
Less Donations received				5584	13	10
Transferred to Income and Expenditure Account during past years	885	2	6			27-5 0 0
Now transferred	290	2	6			
Valuation of Stocks of Publications						273 2 6
" Library						450 0 0
" Photographic Department ..						1500 0 0
" Paper in hand for printing Journal						200 0 0
						I 0 0
						£5762 4 9

Examined and found correct.

(Signed) C. F. CLAY.
W. E. F. MACMILLAN.

Dr.

'JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES' ACCOUNT.

FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.

CR.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
To Printing and Paper, Vol. LVII	473	9	2	By Sales, including back Vols.			
" Plates	24	7	2	Per Macmillan & Co., Ltd.	133	17	9
" Drawing and Engraving	38	19	9	" Hellenic Society	8	19	3
" Editing and Reviews	76	1	6				
" Packing, Addressing, and Carriage to Members	149	17	11	" Receipts from Advertisements			112 17 0
				Balance to Income and Expenditure Account ...			17 1 5
							<u>602 17 1</u>
							<u>£762 15 6</u>

LANTERN SLIDES AND PHOTOGRAPHS ACCOUNT.

FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
To Slides and Photographs for Sale	14	10	2	By Receipts from Sales and Hire			55 18 2
" Slides for Hire	6	8	2	" " Sale of Catalogues, &c.			1 16 0
" Balance to Income and Expenditure Account	36	15	10				<u>£57 14 2</u>

LIBRARY ACCOUNT. PURCHASES AND BINDING.

FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
To Purchases	60	1	8	By Receipts from Sales of Catalogues, Duplicates, &c.	23	3	0
" Binding	59	3	6	" Balance to Income and Expenditure Account	126	19	5
" Cost of printing Accessions Lists to the Library and Slides Departments, less contribution from the Roman Society	30	17	3				
							<u>£150 2 5</u>

LIBRARY PREMISES ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1937.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Rent	405	5	0	Contributions by the B.S.A. and B.S.R.	20	0	0
Rates	128	17	5	London Association of Accountants	650	0	0
Transferred from Balance Sheet—Proportion of Expendi- ture for Year	23	0	0				
Balance to Income and Expenditure Account	112	17	7				<u>£670 0 0</u>




FIG. 1.—MOUNT KASIOS FROM THE MOUTH OF THE ORONTES.

EXCAVATIONS AT AL MINA, SUEIDIA

I. THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

[PLATES I-IV ; 5 MAPS IN ENVELOPE.]

THE excavations at al Mina, Sueidia, were undertaken as part of a programme of research covering a wide field in time and space. The object with which we set out was the tracing of connexions, if such existed, between the early civilisations of the Aegean, in particular that of Minoan Crete, and the more ancient cultural centres of hither Asia. Oriental influences working upon the art of Knossos have sometimes been suspected, but little evidence has been adduced to prove them; in some of the later periods of history, as for example in the 'Orientalising' phase of Rhodian pottery or in the Corinthian fabrics, the influence has always been obvious but the point of contact has remained obscure; intercourse may have been indirect, through the principalities of Asia Minor and the Ionian coastal towns, as has generally been assumed, or there may have been a more direct channel perpetuating perhaps an older tradition. I was myself strongly prejudiced in favour of direct contact, but only excavation could prove or disprove the theory; and the first step was to select a site which could give definite evidence.

The south coast of Asia Minor was ruled out by the terms of the enquiry. The only part of that coast which might seem to offer facilities for trade with the interior is the Cilician plain, but actually from it communications with the East are not easy; the plain is really an enclave cut off by the Taurus and the Amanus ranges from the Hittites of the Halys basin almost as effectually as from the much more important Mesopotamian

centres,¹ and if Greek tradition can be trusted, Soli, the earliest settlement of Greeks on the Cilician shore, was founded by Achaeans and Rhodians at a date too late for our purpose. On the Syrian coast Mycenaean and sub-Mycenaean remains are not uncommon; from Ras Shamra (Leukos Hormos) in the north to the southern Philistine cities such as Askalon the pottery bears witness to oversea relations with the Aegean;² but coastal trade does not necessarily involve a direct link between the Aegean and Mesopotamia, and the coastal cities themselves had not, so far as we can tell, attained a culture-level entitling them to exercise any great influence on the islands. Palestine certainly was but a backwater. But the deciding factor was the geographical. Parallel to the coast runs the long mountain chain which is Amanus in the north and Lebanon in the south; behind the mountains stretches the Syrian desert, opposing an effective barrier to direct communication with the east; the caravan route from Mesopotamia to Syria ascended the Euphrates and keeping to the 'Fertile Crescent' cut across from Meskeneh or Carchemish to Aleppo and so southwards through country where food and water were not hard to find; even the Tadmor by-pass was but a late invention.³ Therefore southern Syria could not well satisfy the requirements of our case; its harbours could feed Hamath, Kadesh and Damascus, but to pass thence to the East proper meant making a laborious détour which would eat up all the profits of a venture. North Syria was clearly indicated as the only promising area. In the first place it was the part of the coast most accessible to ancient shipping; Mount Kasios is visible from Cyprus, and the Greek ships' captains always hugged the shore and demanded a landfall. In the second place the 'Fertile Crescent' turns inland from the North Syrian coast and leads directly eastwards. Thirdly, it is in North Syria that we have the meeting-place of the Hittite and of the Mesopotamian civilisations, so that if either, or both, played a part in the development of Aegean culture, here we should have the best chance of discovering the evidence of their reactions. But the geographical argument went further than this, and narrowed down far more closely the area of profitable search.

Commerce demands a sheltered anchorage for its shipping and good trade-routes from harbour to market. The North Syrian coast from Issus in the extreme north almost to Latakia (*i.e.*, to Leukos Hormos) is formed by a range of mountains whose flanks drop for the most part precipitously to the sea; treacherous rock-shelves and storm-beaten cliffs make it impossible of approach. In the northern angle the Gulf of Alexandretta affords an open roadstead which in most weathers is tolerably sheltered⁴ and at its southern end there is, at Arsus, a little rocky harbour which has been artificially improved and enlarged. Arsus, though so deeply overlaid by Roman remains as to give small encouragement to the excavator, is an

¹ That Hatti did at times exercise a certain control over Cilicia is proved by monuments (*e.g.*, Muvatalli on the rock-carving at Sirkeli: Garstang and Guterbock in *L.A.A.* xxiv, Nos. 1-2, p. 64 ff.), but even so the country seems to have been always a separate and generally a more or less independent kingdom.

² In 1935 Ras Shamra had not produced any Minoan sherds such as have been found since then.

³ *I. Kings* ix. 18.

⁴ The flat and marshy plain of Alexandretta is of recent formation, and in antiquity the sea washed the foothills, making it more dangerous than it is to-day for a sailing-vessel that might drag its anchor.

ancient site which answers to one of our conditions; but from it land traffic would have had to skirt the foothills for a distance of some twenty-five miles and then, striking inland, to climb the steep and difficult Beilan Pass to the Amk plain. The pass may well have been dangerous in more ways than one. A very striking fact in the archaeology of this part of the country is that whereas there are settlements on the sea-coast, and the flat plain and the rolling steppe east of the mountains are thickly strewn with *tells* of the Bronze and Early Iron Age, in the mountain area there has not been found a single vestige of ancient habitation; the line is so sharply drawn that the *tells* of the Amk plain may approach within two or three hundred yards of the foothills, but not one takes advantage of the natural rise; the ancient builders left even the skirts of the mountains severely alone. We know that those mountains were thickly wooded, for the kings of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys derived from them their supplies of cedar-wood; ⁵ they were not uninhabited therefore, but the inhabitants must have been huntsmen, woodcutters and perhaps miners (for copper is plentiful and there is gold in the bed of the Kara Su, the Melas of the Greeks), wild men, who had no use for cities, and their scattered huts would leave no vestige behind for us to discover. The townsmen and farmers of the plain in their turn had no use for such barbarians, and their civilisation never penetrated into the forests; merchant caravans might well fear the passage across a tract whose population was unfriendly, where brigandage has always been a natural trade, and where the difficulties of the road invited ambush and gave every advantage to the attack.

South of Arsus there projects the forbidding headland of Ras al Khanzir, and from it the cliffs of Gebel Musa end with the shallow arc of the Gulf of Sueidia, having the ruins of Seleucia at its northern end, the Orontes' mouth towards its southern end, and beyond that the rockbound coast at the foot of Mount Kasios. Between Mount Kasios and Leukos Hormos the only other harbour is Basit. Basit has generally been identified with the ancient Posidium, ⁶ and if so ought to supply precisely that link between Hither Asia and the Aegean which was the objective of our expedition, for Posidium has its legendary foundation before the Trojan War, ⁷ but the surface indications witness to no occupation earlier than the Roman period and, what is more important, communication with the interior is lacking; a breakneck track alone leads up into the wild fastnesses of the hills. ⁸ The Sueidia area was the only one which combined all the advantages sought by the early trader. Mt. Kasios gives the needed landfall. The mouth of the Orontes, which winds across the deltaic plain, afforded a safe and sheltered anchorage where ships could tie up against the high banks, while the river itself was in those days navigable as far as the site of Antioch. From the apex of the delta an easy road runs inland through a gap in the mountain range, following for the most part the course of the

⁵ So Gudea, in the twenty-fourth century B.C., brought the timbers for his temple of Nin-gir-su from 'the Amanus, the cedar mountain.' F. Thureau-Dangin, *SAKI* p. 68 (16.5.28).

⁶ As, most recently, by R. Dussaud in *Topo-*

graphie historique de la Syrie, pp. 418-421.

⁷ See below, p. 30.

⁸ For a brief report of a reconnaissance at Basit see C. Schaeffer in *Syria*, xvi. ii. (1935), pp. 173 sq.

river and elsewhere passing through open, rolling country, to debouch on the Amk plain. Here, from what is to-day a vast expanse of lake and marsh and level ploughland, there rise more than a hundred *tells*, the ruins of ancient cities and villages; in the Bronze Age it must have been densely populated and enormously rich, so that the oversea merchant would have found here a very valuable interim market for his goods. But that was not the end; the road runs on eastwards to Aleppo by a level pass through the hills which divide the plain from the higher grassy steppes, and thence the caravan-routes went past Carchemish to Asshur and down the Euphrates to Babylon; there was no desert to be crossed, but through easy country one gained the Syro-Hittite cities and the centres of Mesopotamian civilisation.

It might be said that up to this point the argument was purely theoretical, and established no more than the likelihood that if there was any trade between the early Aegean and the hinterland of Syria, it would have taken the Orontes route in preference to the others. Immediately on my arrival in North Syria in 1935 it received unexpected support, for Mr. Calvin W. McEwan, field director of the Oriental Institute of Chicago's expedition in the Amk plain, kindly allowed me to examine the objects resulting from their three years of work, and amongst the potsherds found in a *sondage* on Tchakaltepe, a *tell* on the eastern edge of the Amk, I recognised two as possessing unmistakable affinities with Minoan Crete; there was material evidence to show that intercourse between Asia and the Aegean did exist, and the find-spot of the potsherds pointed to the Orontes valley rather than any other route as the channel of such intercourse.

With M. Claude Prost, Inspector of Antiquities for the Sandjak of Alexandretta,⁹ I went down to the mouth of the Orontes in search of the mound which *ex hypothesi* should represent the ancient harbour. We were at first attracted by two sites on the foothills behind the little modern town of Sueidia, where, mixed with Roman remains, there were sherds of the fourth century B.C., but in the one case scarcely half a metre of debris remained over the natural rock, and the other, too, seemed most unlikely to repay excavation. Our real objective was found in the flat delta, about a mile and a half from the present sea-line (which has advanced considerably during the last 2500 years), where a single warehouse, a Customs Officer's house and a few cottages, known collectively as *al Mina*, 'The Port,' represent the harbour of antiquity. Just to the north of the hamlet there is a low artificial mound, not more than four metres high; on the east it falls in a steep bank to the flat ploughland, the narrow northern point is similarly abrupt; from the edge of the scarp the surface shelves down almost imperceptibly towards the existing harbour on the south, and on the west to gardens and to the fields beyond them; the road from Sueidia to *al Mina* crosses the *tell*, and was found to be strewn with fragments of pottery ranging in date from the eighth century B.C. to the fourteenth century A.D. From the north end of the *tell* the Orontes is distant by some two

⁹ M. Prost was killed in a motor accident in the summer of 1936. His death was a serious blow to archaeology in North Syria, for to keen scholarship

and untiring energy he added a detailed knowledge of his province such as no other man possessed.

hundred metres, then a turn of the channel brings it up against the tail-end of the mound just where the cottages of the modern hamlet begin, and here in the high and precipitous earth-bank there could be seen the ends of walls built of rubble and cement and many fragments of late pottery, while on the surface lay two small column-shafts of mediaeval type. The higher part of the mound, between the road and the little cliff, was cultivated land, and in the soil turned by the plough pottery fragments were numerous; the earlier fragments were most common towards the northern end, where, sheltered by wild olive-trees, there were a well, a rest-house and a walled enclosure containing the tomb or cenotaph of an Alouite saint, Sheikh Yusuf al Moghrabi, after whom the mound proper is named (Pl. I, 1).

Permission to excavate the site was readily granted by the Service des Antiquités of the French Mandatory Power, to which we have been throughout indebted for sympathy and help of every description, and work was carried on during the spring season of 1936 and again in 1937. For the initial season the whole of the funds required were collected from private subscribers, on the initiative of Major-General Sir Neill Malcolm, except for a contribution from the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, while the Trustees of the British Museum lent the services of Mr. F. N. Pryce. My wife was responsible for drawings and for field work, and as general archaeological assistant we had Mr. P. W. Murray-Thriepland: towards the end of the season Lieut.-Colonel A. H. Burn volunteered to take the place of Mr. Pryce, who had had to return to London. In 1937 the Trustees of the British Museum made a large grant towards the cost of the Atchana work; the balance of the fund came from Oxford and from private sources, the subscribers of the year before generously renewing their help. Mr. Murray-Thriepland again joined my wife and myself; Mr. Pryce's place was taken by Mr. E. A. Lane of the Victoria and Albert Museum; and Mr. Arnold Silcock, as a volunteer worker, was responsible for the architectural side of the al Mina excavations. To the help of all these I am profoundly indebted.

In the present report I am concerned only with what may be called the more strictly archaeological results of our work, *i.e.*, with the buildings and their chronological sequence, the small objects, and the general history of the site. Separate reports will be made on objects of various categories by scholars more competent than myself; thus, Professor J. D. Beazley will deal with the red-figured pottery, Mr. E. S. Robinson and Mr. Derek Allen with the coins,^{9a} Mr. C. M. Robertson with the earlier pottery, and Mr. E. A. Lane with the mediaeval glass and glazed wares; my own references to such material will be made merely for the sake of the completeness of the archaeological record.

The cadastral survey plan published on Fig. 2 shews the area excavated in the course of the two seasons; it comprises some seven thousand square metres and was dug to an average depth of four metres and a half. We did not touch the south end of the mound, nor yet such part of it as lies to the west of the modern road, for as the work progressed it became clear that the archaic levels in which we were interested did not extent farther to the

^{9a} See for the coins of our 1936 season, *Numismatic Chronicle*, Fifth Series, vol. xvii.

south, and that westwards also only the poorer quarters of the later periods would be encountered; with the exception of the mediaeval ruins, which lay south of the older site, nothing of real importance was to be expected beyond the limits of the excavated area.

Below the foundations of the Crusading town which formed our highest stratum ¹⁰ we found nine building levels which between them represent a




FIG. 2.—MAP INDICATING AREA EXCAVATED.

continuous history beginning with the eighth century B.C. and ending shortly before 300 B.C. The detailed description of those levels will be better understood if prefaced by a general account summarising the results of the excavation.

Because the history of the site was continuous, the distinction of levels is not uniform throughout it. At no moment was the town destroyed and rebuilt as a whole; what happened was that as each building or block of buildings fell into disrepair or became ripe for remodelling, it was

¹⁰ To be published by Mr. E. A. Lane in the *Antiquaries' Journal*.

dismantled and replaced by another, while its neighbours might be left to stand for many years longer. Sometimes therefore a new 'level' may consist in little more than the addition of a few new walls and the laying of a somewhat higher floor; sometimes it may mean entire reconstruction over the razed ruins of the old; the same phases occur, but buildings of the same date, even though adjacent, are not necessarily on the same horizontal plane, and each block had to be classified on its own evidence rather than by reference to its neighbour. Moreover, there was a gradual shift in the town's position which accentuated the differences of level. It has been remarked above that the mediaeval town covers but a small part of the old and extends far beyond it to the south: this considerable displacement results from the long gap in time between the two occupations of the site, and is but an extreme instance of what had been going on throughout early history. The place was a port, set originally as close to the sea as conditions made possible. Always the silt of the Orontes was adding to the delta, the distance between port and sea increased, and inevitably the tendency was for new buildings to be erected on the south side of the town; the town, in fact, followed the slowly retreating coastline. The series of plans published in this report will make the fact tolerably clear; those of the older periods shew but a small area confined to the northern end of the site; the late levels are conterminous with our excavations, and the mediaeval is confined to the south half. The older a town is the higher will its buildings rise above the plain, resting as they do on the stratified ruins of older houses successively rebuilt; already by the eighth century B.C. the al Mina port must have occupied a slight mound, and any southward extension added after that date must have been built on the mound's flank and on the low ground beyond it; and the result of this is to confuse still further the 'levels' of our different periods if we attempt to regard them as horizontal planes. Incidentally it accounts for another feature of our plans. It will be noticed that the plans of Level II and Level III are much less complete at the north end of the site; it is because their buildings here lay on higher ground, on the top of the then-existing *tell*, and so have been subject to more severe denudation.

The southward shifting of the town helps to explain another fact most important for its history. The existing levels carry that history back to the eighth century B.C. at most, but there can be little doubt but that its foundation was more ancient. We have in our excavations reached the extreme limits of the *tell* to the north, and have failed to find any traces of earlier settlement; but the northern limits of the *tell* do not by any means correspond to the northern limits of the ancient site; it was useless for us to dig further, for there is nothing there to find, but that is not to say that there never was anything.

The course of a river running through a delta is always variable, and it is certain that the Orontes has more than once cut for itself a different channel to the sea. Even where there is no sudden change, a gradual shifting of the river-bed is normal. At the present time the high earth-bank which forms the jetty of al Mina is being steadily undermined by the current, and its ramshackle buildings are in jeopardy; the same must have

been true in antiquity, and it would seem that together with the movement southwards there was also a westward movement as the Orontes, running on the east of the town, slowly eroded its bank and forced men to build farther inland. But the catastrophic element has played its part too. Between a century and a century and a half ago, according to local tradition, the river left its bed where that makes a sharp turn a mile or so above al Mina and, moving westwards, came up against the mound upon the north and east and proceeded to wash it away. On the mound stood the shrine and cenotaph of Sheikh Yusuf al Moghrabi which to-day occupies the extreme angle of the little scarp, but must have originally been more or less in the middle of the *tell*; when this was threatened the indignant saint rebuked the waters and ordered them to return to their former channel, which they obediently did, and the modern pilgrimages to the sheikh's tomb commemorate the peasants' gratitude for the preservation of their fields. That the story is based on fact is obvious from the ground-plan. The low cliff along the north and north-east is definitely due to water action, and represents the bank of the river when it had reached the westernmost point of its advance; the streets and houses of the ancient town break away, as shewn by the ground-plans, at the cliff face, but did continue indefinitely beyond it. That part of the old site has been swept into the Mediterranean is certain, but there is no means of deciding how much of its area has gone; all that we can say is that what remains of the earliest levels is so small as to imply a considerable extension northwards, and that, in view of the southward movement of the port, any buildings of a date earlier than the ninth century B.C. would have lain altogether to the north of the *tell* as we have it now, and would inevitably have disappeared.

That there were earlier buildings can, I think, safely be assumed, for the sufficient reason that the import trade by the Orontes valley is older than the existing ruins. Our attention was drawn to a small hill called Sabouni lying beside the river about three miles upstream from al Mina; the stories told us of sensational discoveries made there had probably little foundation in fact, but the potsherds which littered its sides were interesting, and accordingly towards the end of our 1936 season we made *sondages* at various points on the summit, on the slopes and at the foot of the rise. These shewed that the place was not one calculated to repay the cost of regular excavation, but the historical results obtained were of considerable importance for their bearing on the question of al Mina.

The hill of Sabouni is natural, a flat-topped mass of very friable conglomerate forming the south end of a ridge outcrop from which it is separated by a saddle; the other three sides, now for the most part gently terraced and cultivated, were once precipitous, but the disintegration of the soft rock has resulted in the lowering of its upper plateau, the collapse of its sides, and the burial of whatever may have been at their foot beneath an enormous mass of detritus. At the bottom of the slope, only just below the modern surface, we found remains of mediaeval buildings, apparently a farm and its appurtenances, for in one of them was a set of five large vessels of copper and iron in which was a collection of agricultural implements of every description, a very valuable illustration of farming methods in the

Crusading period—a steel-yard decorated with a cross, and a few coins, served as dating evidence. There were no traces of anything Roman or Seleucid, here or elsewhere on the site, and it would seem that throughout those periods it was not inhabited; the next period represented was the fourth century B.C. A very deep trench cut against and parallel to the foot of the rock gave only an inverted stratification, the older material occurring in the upper levels and fifth–fourth century Attic pottery at a depth of more than five metres; this of course was because we were digging through debris fallen from above and the upper levels had necessarily fallen first. On the summit of the rock a few shallow pockets produced a single course of rubble foundation and fragments of pottery; otherwise all had disappeared downhill. A cut at the edge of the plateau brought to light remains of a massive enceinte wall of rubble and mud brick, below which the rock face had been artificially scarped; the sheer cliff with the wall above would have been proof against the attacks of any barbarian enemy. It was evident that there had been here in the Greek period a fortified acropolis with, probably, a town at its foot.¹¹ The potsherds formed a sequence running through Attic red-figured and black-figured wares, Rhodian, Cypriote and Island Geometric to the white ‘milk-bowls’ of the Cypriote Bronze Age and to Mycenaean. Thus the Sabouni site repeats in every respect the record of al Mina, but carries it back a stage farther in time. Clearly the two sites were very closely related, and it is reasonable to suppose that what was true from the eighth century to the fourth was true also for the earlier period, although on one of them the evidence is lacking. Al Mina must have been the port of entry for the foreign goods used at Sabouni; and when we find Cypriote Bronze Age pottery and Mycenaean pottery common in the *tells* of the Amk plain, which lie on the trade-route running up the Orontes valley, it is equally reasonable to suppose that for them too al Mina was the distributing centre. When those *tells* produce, as they do, wares showing affiliation with the art of Minoan Crete, we may without unduly straining the evidence credit the al Mina port with a foundation going back to the Bronze Age.¹²

For the five centuries which the actual ruins represent, the nine levels are enough to give a very detailed record. It has been pointed out that the building strata are not consistent levels, *i.e.*, that they do not severally conform to horizontal planes, and seeing that the vertical space which they occupy does not total more than four metres and a half the vertical interval between them can in no case be great, and in some cases it is, indeed, reduced almost to nothing; none the less, the distinction between them was not difficult. Level II is little more than a reconstruction of Level III, and Level III re-uses a good deal of Level IV; but even so there was not much risk of confusion. Not only were the floors raised, but when a wall was to be rebuilt on the ruins of the old, the normal practice was to trim

¹¹ In the deep trench Cypriote sherds were found below the Attic as well as above; they were not really *in situ*, but may imply the existence of early buildings below the acropolis. The trench was filled with boulders and rubble from the acropolis

wall, lying above the 4th-century pottery, which proves that the ruin of the town dates to after that period.

¹² See on this my report on the excavations at Atchana in the *Antiquaries' Journal*, xviii, p. 1.

down equally the old mud brick and to lay on it new stone foundations before fresh mud-brick building was begun. The two things really go together. The purpose of the stone foundations was to protect the wall from the effects of damp, which would operate most at floor-level, where water might collect; the floor was therefore generally laid on a level a little below the top of the stone foundations of the wall. If the floor was raised, the old foundations, buried beneath the new mud packing, became useless, and new stonework was needed to correspond to the new floor; thus in a single wall we might sometimes find three bands of rubble masonry separated by mud brickwork, meaning that the same wall line had been followed in three successive periods, and the pottery appropriate to each period would be found against each masonry band.

In the lowest levels, VIII, IX and X, there was scarcely any difference of plane, and the periods had to be distinguished by the orientation of the walls, by their bonding and by their intersection, the older having been cut through to lay the foundations of the new. But even here, although the wall-foundations might lie at virtually the same depth, there would be a difference of floor-level, and the stratification of the pottery proved that we had to deal with three historic phases, and with that knowledge it was possible to recognise structural distinctions which might otherwise have been overlooked or regarded as but accidental. Rebuilding at almost the same level had of course resulted in a destruction of the older stratum much more complete than was the case when the strata were separated by a reasonable spatial interval, and the ground-plans of the earlier levels have little coherence, and in themselves little meaning, but of most of them enough remains to shew that the general character of the buildings, and their use, were not unlike those of later structures for which the evidence is better preserved.

Throughout the whole period the building material employed at al Mina was the same: foundations were of stone and the superstructure was of mud brick. Very occasionally, in the case of an interior wall, the stone foundation was omitted; sometimes in the later periods the stonework was carried up well above ground-level and could be called something more than a foundation, but this too was rare. In the earliest periods the foundations were very shallow, generally consisting of a single course laid apparently on the surface of the ground and not in a foundation-trench, and the stones were rounded pebbles collected from the river-bed or from the beach; later on better methods were employed, two or more courses took the place of one, and instead of pebbles there were large boulders mixed with quarried rubble, these giving sufficient height for the foundation to be set in a trench below ground-level and still to rise above the level of the floor. Ashlar was very seldom used; there is one instance of a wall being faced with well-cut blocks in Level V (Sq. H. 10) and in Level IV (Sq. G. 10), and fairly good squared facing-stones of some size, recalling the Hittite tradition of orthostats, distinguished a long outer wall of Level II (Sq. G. 9), while quarry-dressed slabs formed the door-jambs of Level III rooms in Sq. J. 6 and Sq. H. 10; in the upper part of a wall stones were used in a single case only, in the curious little recess of Level II (Sq. J. 7; Pl. I, 2). The mud brick

was seldom preserved at all, and where it did remain it was generally in such bad condition that the individual bricks could not be measured with any accuracy. In one wall in Level III the bricks were found to measure 0.40 m. \times 0.30 m. (?) \times 0.14 m. (Pl. II. 2), and in a Level IV wall 0.40 m. \times 0.20 m. \times 0.12 m.; such very large and clumsy bricks (not unlike those used in the neighbourhood at the present day) may perhaps shew the influence of Assyrian building. Burnt bricks were not found at all, but in the little recess of Level II already mentioned there were burnt tiles, used for flooring, which measure 0.22 m. square. The only other material used is cement, which occurs occasionally in Level III and in Level II is fairly common for floors, is found as the lining of drains and is once (in the little recess) used for wall-plaster. The normal wall-plaster is mud. In the vast majority of cases only the foundations of the wall remained, and since these stood very little above floor-level, it was only occasionally that the position of doors could be ascertained, for generally the stone foundation was carried across the door-opening to serve as a threshold, and the opening itself would have been in the mud-brick superstructure only; consequently the details of the ground-plans have often to be conjecturally supplied.

Although the walls are fairly thick, the average being 0.70 m., there is no reason to suspect a second storey in any of the buildings; no sign of a staircase was ever found. There were no roofing-tiles in any of the buildings of the Greek period, and it can safely be assumed that the roofs were of the type normal in the country down to the present day,¹³ *i.e.*, that they consisted of layers of matting, reeds and mud laid over close-set rafters of poplar-poles, and were almost flat. Floors, except in Level II, where cement was sometimes employed, were of beaten clay or mud; in the lowest levels, VIII, IX and X, the mud might be laid over a pebble foundation, for the reason that the sand on which the houses were built formed a bad bedding for a mud floor; in the higher levels the pebbles were not necessary and were not used.

Had this been a residential town, we should have judged it, on the evidence of its buildings, to have been poor, if not barbarous; mere huts of mud brick, of one storey, with mud-plastered walls and with no pretence to architectural style or decoration, would seem to call for no more flattering description. But the lay-out of the buildings, at least in the later times of Levels II, III and IV, and their contents throughout the entire period, are not consistent with such a judgement. The fact is that it was not a residential town, and its buildings, which would have been poor as private houses, were perfectly adequate to their purpose; what we have here are the stores and business premises of merchants engaged in the import and export trade between Asia and the Aegean.

This is most obvious in the case of the upper levels, partly because in them the ground-plans are so much better preserved that we can distinguish the character of the buildings without any hesitation, partly because their contents were on the whole more numerous and, what is more important, were in better order—the destruction of some of the buildings by fire had

¹³ Normal, that is, to Moslem houses; the Christian and (usually) the Alouite house of to-day has a tiled roof.

resulted in the objects being left *in situ* so that the furnishing of many of the rooms was virtually intact. Thus in Level III, a large part of which had been burnt, we find that the different rooms in a single building are devoted to goods of different sorts; one is filled with great wine-jars (Pl. IV, 1), another with small lekythi of local make, a third with imported Greek aryballi, a fourth with the bell-kraters, and so on; not only a room but a whole building or set of buildings may be given over more or less exclusively to goods of one sort. Evidently these were the magazines of the merchants whose trade went through the port; here goods ready for export were stored pending the departure of the ships oversea, here goods disembarked from incoming merchantmen were warehoused for eventual sale to the land-traders whose caravans would forward them to the cities of the interior.

Regarded from this point of view, the buildings fully justify themselves. For the earlier levels the remains are too fragmentary for us to do more than argue to their character from the analogy of the higher levels,¹⁴ but for those, *i.e.*, for the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the ground-plans show a lay-out which is on the whole so systematic that it would seem to have been planned rather than to have developed accidentally. The buildings form *insulae* which are approximately rectangular and reasonably uniform in size; between them are streets or lanes intersecting at right angles, running N.W. \times S.E. and N.E. \times S.W., gravel-paved, down which may run a drain whose cover of stone slabs forms a pavement. One remarks certain turns and irregularities which must be due to the accidents of proprietary rights on either side of the thoroughfare,¹⁵ but such are reduced to the minimum. It would be too much to expect uniformity in the individual *insulae*, but even there we can see evidence of something approaching a standard plan. Thus House E of level III (Sq. E.-G., 6-8 on the plan) has a deep courtyard opening onto the street on the N.E. which is flanked by store-rooms along either side, each range consisting of a larger central room with smaller rooms at the ends; at the back of the court are four more or less square chambers; this complex occupies the whole area of the *insula* except for a narrow strip along the S.E. side which is divided up into little rooms (so it would seem, but some of the dividing walls have gone) which have no connexion with the unit to the N.W. House J of the same period (Sq. D.-F. 3-4 on Plan 2) shews a deep courtyard opening onto the street at the S.W., flanked by store-rooms and with a long single magazine at its far end; a small isolated chamber stands out from the S.E. wall in the court itself. Behind this is a building, House K, which, though incomplete, appears to have been very similar in character; along the S.E. side of the block, between these units and the street, there is a strip, wider than that in House E, divided by walls so as to form two or more smaller and simpler units. The House L next door to this on the N.W. was clearly of the same type, a courtyard building occupying the south corner of the

¹⁴ The analogy cannot be pressed very far. It looks as if there had been a complete remodelling of the town between Levels V and IV, at least in the N.E. part of it, and only on the N.W. side do the lines of the streets more or less agree.

¹⁵ *E.g.*, the short right-angled turn in Sq. E. 8 and the deflection of the road in Sq. D. 7, after which the line is brought back to the true. (Level III, Plan.)

site and a more elaborate complex running along its N.W. edge. If we compare with this an earlier period, we shall find precisely the same type illustrated by House A of Level IV (Plan, Sqq. A.-D., 2-3); there is the same courtyard with a small chamber projecting in one corner, the magazines flanking the court with the row of chambers at its far end on the N.W. side, and the row of unconnected rooms completing the *insula*.¹⁶

It is doing no violence to our evidence to say that we have here a standard type of office and warehouse building which had been evolved by the beginning of the fifth century B.C. and persisted for the next hundred and fifty years. Merchandise would be brought into the courtyard to be unpacked and sorted; the small room in the court we might interpret as a tally-clerk's office; the store-rooms are sufficiently explained by what we find inside them. The small disconnected rooms along the street frontage must be shops, mostly of the 'lock-up' type, belonging to retail traders dealing with the local market, or workshops. Thus Room 2 of House E (Level III, Sq. E. 7) seems to have been the workshop of a jeweller, for in it were found small bars of silver and various bits of jewellery, including the fine necklace of gold and silver illustrated on Fig. 9. Small hoards of silver coins and numerous weights testify rather to retail trade than to the business of the importers. The reconstruction by Mr. Arnold Silcock on Figs. 3 and 4 shows as faithfully as possible the character of the typical building.

That the merchants occasionally lived in their business quarters is proved by the fact that graves¹⁷ were sometimes found below the floors of the buildings, stone coffins (Pl. III, 1) either built of large slabs of limestone or cut out of a single block; for whereas we have plenty of analogies for the burying of the dead under the houses which they occupied in life, it is scarcely conceivable that the custom should arise of burial below a business office or a warehouse. In one case (Sqq. L.-M. 10, Level III) we have a four-roomed block with a coffin under each room, and this must necessarily have been a proper residence; sometimes the coffin is under the back room of a shop (Level III, Sqq. F. 4 and D. 7). But the burials are very few in number, and since apart from them all the evidence is against the buildings having been used for domestic purposes, we must conclude that the majority of the tradesmen—all who could afford to do so—lived at a distance, and only came down to their places of business in the port for the working hours of the day. The port can hardly have been a salubrious spot. It lay very low, on ground which was liable to be flooded—as indeed is proved by our finding masses of sand and silt above the low-lying houses at the south end of Level IV;¹⁸ the ground round about it, now corn-land and orchard, must then have been marsh scarcely redeemed from the sea. It seems to me fairly certain that the fortified hill-town of Sabouni, which I have already

¹⁶ The impost-stone against the middle of the N.E. wall of room has an exact parallel in the impost-stone against the middle of the N.E. wall of room 1 in House E of Level III.

¹⁷ They belong to Levels II and III: none of Level IV were found.

¹⁸ As I have explained above, Level IV extended to the south beyond Level V, so that the houses here were built not on the *tell* formed by the ancient settlement, but at its foot; they were at about the same height above the river as the houses of Level VI.

described, was the place where lived the merchants who did business at al Mina; others probably had villas on the rising ground on which Sueidia lies, where two areas at least produce potsherds of classical date, but Sabouni




FIG. 3.—RECONSTRUCTION OF A WAREHOUSE.

was the town proper, standing to al Mina something in the relation of Athens to the Peiraeus.^{18a} Al Mina was not of course without its inhabitants; the poorer classes—the dock labourers, store-guards, sailors and fishermen, as well as a number of petty traders—necessarily lived where their work was; but we find not the least trace of such good houses and public buildings as

^{18a} Compare also Ugarit (Ras Shamra) with its adjacent harbour.

must have adorned the town where lived the merchants engaged in the 'luxury trade' between Greece and Asia.

Those merchants must have been Greeks. That such was the case at Ras Shamra, farther south, in the Mycenaean age is proved by the finding there under the houses of stone-built tombs which in their construction and their furniture parallel those of the Greek mainland. At al Mina the Mycenaean age is not represented, and for no later period is the evidence so




FIG. 4.—PLAN OF THE RECONSTRUCTED WAREHOUSE.

conclusive as that given by the Ras Shamra tombs, but of the fact there can be little doubt. Such fragments of inscription as we have are in Greek; the *graffiti* on vases, which are in the nature of traders' marks, are in Greek also. The harbours of North Syria are so cut off geographically from the interior by the barrier of the Amanus (in spite of the passes of the Orontes valley and Beilan) that they have always tended to belong politically to Europe rather than to Asia; this is true of Alexandretta at the present

time, where the heads of business firms are seldom Syrians, and it is likely to have been so in the past; and at al Mina, where the foreign trade was exclusively with Greece, the handling of the trade can scarcely have been done by others than Greeks or Levantines of Greek origin.

Perhaps one effect of this can be seen in the character of the imports. In Levels V and VI, more especially in Level V, the bulk of the trade is with Rhodes, and Corinth figures as a rather bad second. Rhodian pottery is found promiscuously over the whole site, and the Corinthian sherds, though far less numerous, are similarly scattered; these were the fashionable goods of the time, and all the importers were obliged to deal with those markets. But when we find, for instance, Naukratite (Chiote?) pottery confined to a single warehouse, and Lesbian *buccheri* in two only, then we are inclined to suspect some prejudice or relation peculiar to an individual merchant which induced him to specialise in a line of goods out of the common run; it would of course be possible for a Syrian dealer to speculate on something of which he had no knowledge, but it is more likely that a Greek should attempt to introduce an unusual type of ware because he had a personal interest in it.

The history of the site as given by its levels is as follows.

Levels X and IX. The pebble foundations rest on virgin soil; the remains of the buildings are very fragmentary; there is practically no rise of level between them, and there was little to distinguish them except the different orientation of the walls. The pottery, which considering the thinness of the combined strata was relatively abundant, was all of sub-geometric type, and while much of it was imported from the Greek islands, some of it was undoubtedly of local fabric. The date of the levels is between 750 and 700 B.C.

Level VIII. While a few walls of the previous period are re-used as foundations, the general plan is quite different, and the town would seem to have been built afresh on new lines. The buildings are badly preserved, and they were not destroyed violently, but gradually decayed, and were rebuilt in the next period, when some of the old wall-foundations were rooted out; although there is a difference of level between VIII and VII it is not great, and the distinction between them is not always easy to recognise. The level therefore represents a period of time commensurate with the lifetime of a single set of buildings—a period, that is, which could scarcely be more than fifty years. The date may be put down as c. 700 to 675 B.C. The pottery shews a complete change from the previous level; it is almost exclusively of the Cypriote Iron Age type, and the vases are either imports from Cyprus or of a local fabric so closely resembling the Cypriote that it is sometimes difficult to determine the place of origin. Nearly always the decoration consists of concentric circles, the other typically Cypriote motive, the ‘metope,’ being rare; of a few pieces it can be said that whereas at first sight they shew Cypriote affinities, they could never have been produced in the island. It will be noted that at al Mina the ‘Cypriote’ style comes in suddenly and entirely swamps the sub-geometric, which had until then been the normal ware; it has no antecedents here, so is evidently introduced from elsewhere, and its monopoly of use, taken with the fact

that the town itself seems to have been rebuilt at the moment of its introduction, supports the view that it comes in as a result of foreign conquest. In Cyprus the Iron Age ware has no proper local antecedents and appears suddenly, already fully developed, together with the introduction of iron. The iron must have come from Asia Minor, and it has with good reason been supposed that the pottery did also. Gjerstad¹⁹ has remarked on the distribution in Cyprus of the two Iron Age pottery types—that with concentric circles and that with the panel scheme of geometric ornament—that one is characteristic of the north part of the islands and the other of the south; and that distinction is not peculiar to Cyprus. At Carchemish the Iron Age sees the incoming of pottery types closely akin to the Cypriote; but whereas the concentric circle decoration is so rare as to make it probable




FIG. 5.—CYPRIOTE KRATER WITH DESIGN OF BULLS FROM LEVEL VIII.

that the examples of it are imports from Cyprus, the 'panel' decoration is the rule on painted ware. In the Beka'a, between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, the characteristic pottery of the Iron Age is decorated with concentric circles in close imitation of the Cypriote, but the vases are of local fabric; but of the 'metope' type not a single example has to my knowledge come to light.²⁰ In Palestine there comes in a 'panel' type of local pottery (formerly termed 'Philistine') affiliated to the Cypriote, although not identical with it, and the concentric circle motive is rare, and occurs mostly on imported vessels. It certainly looks as if we had to deal with the products of two Asia Minor peoples who at the beginning of the Iron Age moved southwards; clans from both occupied Cyprus, clans from one or the other made their homes in different parts of Syria; in the

¹⁹ *Classifications des céramiques antiques: Cypriote Pottery*, pp. 42-43.
JHS—VOL. LVIII.

²⁰ I published pottery of this sort in *Syria*, ii (1921), pp. 177 *et seq.*

north of Syria one branch settled at Carchemish, people of the other branch took al Mina, re-founded the port and by means of trade kept up a close connexion with their kinsmen in Cyprus.

Level VII. This follows on Level VIII without any break of continuity; the buildings, as already noted, are but a new version of the old, departing very little from their lines; the floor-level is but little higher. The date, judging by the pottery, is roughly from 675 to 650 B.C. The pottery shows the Cypriote tradition still in force, but it is losing ground. Whereas in Level VIII only a few scattered sherds of sub-geometric were found, in Level VII there is a recrudescence of the sub-geometric fashion, and by the end of the period, at least, the two wares are fairly balanced. The change is due to the growing competition of Rhodes; it is now definitely Rhodian sub-geometric that begins to drive Cyprus out of the market.

Levels VI and V. These two levels, which between them represent the period 650 to 550 B.C., are best taken together as two consecutive phases in a single stage of the port's history. There is no definite break with the past, but the buildings of Level VI replace rather than modify those of Level VII; the latter had fallen hopelessly into decay, and advantage was taken of the fact to build on new lines; it already becomes possible to recognise—without undue exercise of the imagination—early examples of the type of office and magazine building which was to become the standard for future times. When these buildings in their turn became obsolete, the new constructions, those of Level V, were but a new edition of the old; there were changes of detail, naturally, but more often than not the walls of Level VI served as foundations for those of Level V, so that the ground-plan of neither can be understood if considered apart from the other—where the ruins do not actually coincide, they usually supplement each other. Even so the remains are fragmentary, and it would have been difficult to decide on their character if we could not argue from the analogy of the later levels, but fortunately we can do so not only on grounds of general probability, but also on material evidence. Already in Levels VI and V we find magazines filled with the fragments of large store-jars which were closely packed in them, and it is obvious that we have to do with precisely the same commercial installation as we find well preserved in Levels III and II; the amount of pottery of other types is evidence pointing in the same direction, though with less assurance.

Something should be said regarding the survival of the pottery. The two levels taken together represent something like a century during which the buildings were in continuous use and there was no disaster such as would result in the burial of one stratum, together with its contents, under a considerable deposit of debris; there was a gradual rise of level, due for the most part to the treading of fresh dirt into the mud floors, but the total of this and of the deliberate laying of new mud surfaces over old and trodden floors makes less than a metre for the hundred years. So slow a process of growth does away with all chances of vessels being overlooked and buried entire. The big store-jars, which always have either rounded or pointed bases (see Pl. IV, 1), when they were not intended for immediate export but were really store-jars, were sunk for about half their height in

the mud floors,²¹ and they therefore survive, or at least the lower halves of them do. The case of the small vessels is different. They were magazined only in transit, and of their coming and going there would normally be no material evidence save that given by accidental breakages. But even when breakages occurred, the broken vessels would not be left where they lay, but it would be someone's duty to sweep up the pieces and remove them to some rubbish-dump—most likely they would be thrown from the quay-side into the river; what we find are the fragments that were overlooked and trodden into the floor—the accident of an accident. This explains why, in the first place, the total amount of fine pottery, large as it is, yet seems small as a record of a century's trading, and, in the second place, the




FIG. 6.—CYPRIOTE TERRA-COTTAS, LEVEL IV.

fragments found so seldom fit together.²² And a corollary is that our finds are not necessarily representative; of the goods that passed safely through the port we know nothing, and it may be that amongst them there were pottery types of which no examples figure amongst our fragments.

But the fragments from these two levels are extraordinarily varied. In Level VI there is still a certain amount of Cypriote pottery, the later Iron Age type with concentric circle decoration in two colours, red and black, on the white slip ground, but by the beginning of Level V this had disappeared. The fact that Cypriote pottery as such failed to find customers does not, however, mean that all commercial relations with Cyprus came to an end; Cypriote terra-cottas (Fig. 6) and limestone

²¹ One supposes that in this case the contents were for sale but were decanted and sold in smaller vessels.

²² Or fit together only to form a larger but none

the less isolated fragment; this happens where a large fragment has been broken again by being trampled on after burial.

sculpture (Fig. 7) carry on the tradition into Level IV; what it does mean is that other Greek centres were producing wares more suited to the luxury trade of the al Mina port. The phrase 'luxury trade' is used advisedly, for from now on the evidence suffices to shew that the al Mina importers addressed themselves to the best centres of production at the time, and from those demanded the best quality of goods that they could produce; the result is that we have here, from an Asiatic port, a collection of early Greek pottery as wide in range and as fine in quality as has come from any site of Greece itself. It is not only that individual pieces are better than anything found elsewhere, though this is true in some cases, but the general standard is astonishingly high; our merchants were dealing with the great cities of the interior where their customers would be persons of taste with the products of other civilised countries to attract them, and it was useless to offer them anything short of the best from Greece. The main market on which al Mina drew was again Rhodes. Our fragments of Rhodian pottery enable us to see the transition in the island from the sub-geometric to the 'Orientalising' style, and of the latter we have numerous and excellent examples. The delicate kylikes, with bands of lustrous black, purple and white, were very much in favour, as were the almost equally delicate bowls with concentric bands of red paint. In Level VI Proto-corinthian wares are fairly common; in Level V they give place to Corinthian, but the latter are far less numerous, and on the evidence it would seem that Corinth was losing touch with the Asiatic market. From the Greek islands generally come great numbers of 'bird bowls' of fine quality. Lesbian *buccheri* was favoured by one or two dealers, and one at least kept Naukratite (or Chiote) pottery. Side by side with the imported wares we find local imitations of some of them which are surprisingly good; the 'bird bowls' and the banded Rhodian kylikes are the most common models, but Corinthian vases also were copied. Further, the old native red-painted and burnished ware had by now been developed to a remarkable degree; the best examples of this are flat, shallow platters of buff ware, finely burnished, which may be left plain, but are more often decorated with concentric circles of red paint, or the inside may be altogether red while thinly-drawn red circles ornament the outside; it is a native ware, but competition with the best products of Greece had forced the native potter to improve his technique until he was producing something not unworthy to stand side by side with the pottery of Corinth and Rhodes; and at the same time his copies of those foreign wares are sometimes calculated to deceive any but the expert.

Level IV. This level can be dated by its pottery as running from c. 520 to 430 B.C. It will be observed that there is therefore a gap in time between it and the last level amounting to about thirty years. It does not seem to be the case that our failure to find objects belonging to the second half of the sixth century B.C. reflects any real gap in the continuous history of the port; it is rather an accident which we can explain by some such supposition as that an unusually clean sweep of the site was made before the buildings of Level IV were started, and that thereby was destroyed the evidence which would have existed for the business activities of the later

years of Level V. That there was a clean sweep is certain. Level IV is laid out in *insulae* which do not correspond to the building-plots of Level V, and the buildings themselves are independent of their predecessors. Occasionally an old wall seems to have been left standing high enough to invite re-use in Level IV, but generally below the floors of Level IV there is rubbish separating them from the stumps of the Level V walls, and this implies a regular process of demolition which might account for the disappearance of late Level V floors and of the pottery which would have lain above them. At Sabouni we found a few fragments of good early black-figured Attic ware, precisely that which was lacking at al Mina; yet Sabouni must have drawn its supplies from al Mina,²³ and I think that on



FIG. 7.—CYPRIOTE TEMPLE BOY, LEVEL IV.

the strength of that fact alone we may safely regard the gap on the latter site as accidental. What is quite certain is that the missing thirty years belonged to the *floruit* of Level V; the earliest date for the first building of Level IV is *c.* 520–10 B.C., judging by the pottery found at its lowest level; and it would have been impossible for earlier pottery to have existed in the rooms and to have left no trace of itself in them while the rooms continued in use, whereas the disappearance of the topmost occupation-stratum of Level V together with all its pottery contents is at any rate not inexplicable.

The re-building and re-planning of the port warehouses coincides with, and may well have resulted from, a revolution in its import business. Up to 550 B.C., the limit for which Level V is instructive, commerce had been fairly general, with the islands taking the leading part and Corinth alone representing the Greek mainland; but before the turn of the sixth century²⁴

²³ Good early black-figured ware from Athens has been found far inland in northern Syria, *e.g.*, at Devi Huyuk on the caravan-route from the Orontes valley to the Euphrates ford at Carchemish *via* Aleppo; see *L.A.A.* vii. (1914), Pl. XXVII.

²⁴ Probably a good deal earlier; we have a moderate amount of black-figured ware, going back to *c.* 520 B.C., and no Corinthian or other Greek fabrics of anything like so late a date, and if the trade with those centres had gone on after 520,

all of those manufacturing centres drop out, and Athens, which had hitherto not been represented by a single potsherd, is found enjoying a virtual monopoly of the Asiatic trade. The only foreign objects not from Attica which we encountered in Level IV were two or three fragments from Cypriote limestone statuettes of the familiar types, the 'temple boy' and the female offrant, and numerous scarabs, mostly of blue paste, from Egypt and more particularly from Naukratis; fragments of 'Phoenician' vases of variegated glass might be of local manufacture or might have come from the southern coast towns; but everything else is Athenian. The coins tell the same story. Attic tetradrachms form the main currency, and a large percentage of them are not Attic originals but local imitations, proving that for the conduct of the business of the port this was the coin most in demand; but the coins of smaller denomination are those of the Phoenician cities, Arvad, Sidon, Cyprus, etc.; these would be employed for the coasting trade, but the fact that only the smaller coins were in general use would seem to imply that the proportions of the coastal trade were inconsiderable as compared with the Attic.^{24a}

As in the earlier periods, so now the merchants of al Mina were dealing only in goods of the best class. For the opening of the period our evidence is scanty, but as soon as the sherds become relatively numerous the average quality of the vases is seen to be very high. For about 480 B.C. we have an excellent example of the work of the Syleus painter, and from then onwards there are vases which can be attributed to one or other of the known masters; owing to the accidents of survival, the bulk of our red-figured pottery belongs to the later period of decadence, but even so most of it represents the best that Athens was making at that decadent time.

It was interesting to find fragments of no less than three (late) Panathenaic vases. One of them, which had been broken and riveted in antiquity, came from the south part of the site, a quarter which seems to have contained the second-hand market, if we may judge by the number of mended vases encountered in it; the other two were mere fragments, and there is no reason to suppose that they were not new when they were broken in the warehouse. The fact that they were here on sale proves, if proof were needed, that such cases were not made solely to be given as prizes to the victors in the Panathenaic games, but could be bought by anyone as souvenirs and might even be exported to foreign markets.

The remarkable thing is that the Athenian merchants first awoke to the possibilities of direct trade with the East towards the close of the sixth century B.C., *i.e.*, just about the time when the conquests of Cyrus in Ionia were beginning to establish Persia as the enemy of Greece, and carried on a big and profitable trade with Persia through this Syrian port during the whole long-drawn agony of the Persian wars, when the very existence of Athens was at stake. It is a curious sidelight on ancient political conditions when we find international trade uninterrupted by international wars and

evidence of it ought to have been forthcoming. On negative evidence it is perhaps rash to say that the Attic monopoly dates back to 520, although it is certain that by then Athens had secured the vast

bulk of the trade.

^{24a} See E. S. Robinson, *Numismatic Chronicle*, Fifth Series, vol. xvii.

merchant-ships discharging their cargoes without let or hindrance in enemy harbours; it is curious also that the standard of exchange in a Persian harbour at that time should have been the coinage of Athens, and that not




FIG. 8.—ATTIC ARYBALLI FOUND IN ROOM F6, LEVEL III.

a single example of the larger Persian coinage should have been found there—nothing but the minor issues of the local Persian mints of the Phoenician coast.

Level III. Over a large part of the area excavated by us the buildings of Level III had been destroyed by fire, and as the ruins had been simply levelled and built over for Level II, the contents were relatively undisturbed and the ground-plan could be recovered with tolerable completeness. The pottery found here dates the level with unusual accuracy as from 430 to 375 B.C.

To a large extent this is a reconstruction at a higher level of the buildings of Level IV; but now we are able to see clearly, for the first time, the regular lay-out of the commercial town, and now too, for the first time, we can compare in detail the contents of the store-rooms. The great oil-jars and the tall-handled wine-amphorae are the most common, *e.g.*, in House A they filled rooms 2, 6, 8, 11, 12 and 13, and next in order are the little lekythi of local make (Pl. IV, 2) which are found stacked in shallow clay bins, hundreds at a time.²⁵ The imported goods were most carefully assorted. Thus one room (8 in House E) contained lamps—Attic lamps of more than one type, and with them the open ‘cocked-hat’ lamps of Syria; in the room next to it (7) were the Attic gutti or lamp-fillers. Room 6 of House F was devoted to aryballi, and it was interesting to find numbers of these bearing the same design (Fig. 8); clearly we had here part of a single consignment sent out by one Athenian factory, probably, indeed, the work of one craftsman. In room 11 of House H there were kotylae only, in room 10 nothing but bell kraters; everything was classified, and it was seldom that remains of vessels of different sorts were found together. The number of weights found was very great. Sometimes they formed regular sets, the commonest being mushroom-shaped weights with ring handles made of bronze and filled with lead; the square, flat lead weights of the Syrian coast towns were found, cubes and round domed weights, and even the characteristic duck-weights of Mesopotamia, as also the Mesopotamian frog type, and one unique piece, a seated ibex in bronze with a strip of metal wound round its neck as if to bring it up to standard. Two very large lead ingots were presumably imported for the local market. Another probable import was mercury; at the north end of the site we found two or three pounds’ weight of liquid metallic mercury loose in the soil, and as cinnabar does not seem to be found in this part of Asia it is likely that what we found came from the Almaden mines of Spain, which in Roman times exported great quantities of the metal; at al Mina it might have been used for the extraction of gold, which is found close by in the Melas valley, and that there were workers in precious metal in the harbour town we know from the discovery of a jeweller’s shop in Sq. E. 7 (Fig. 9).²⁶

The extent to which al Mina was a Greek town is in this period well demonstrated by the locally made pottery. All the vessels in ordinary

²⁵ The first time we found them thus I supposed that we had to do with the ruins of a kiln, for the floor and sides of the clay enclosure were burnt red and many of the lekythi blackened by heat; subsequently we were able to see that this was the result of the oil which the lekythi had contained catching fire.

²⁶ Liquid mercury is found also in considerable quantities in the soil in one part of the site of Seleucia, and the explanation of it is presumably the same, the trade having simply shifted there when the new harbour was built. I am indebted to Lord Rayleigh for the note *re* Almaden.



FIG. 9.—GOLD AND ELECTRUM NECKLACE, LEVEL III.



FIG. 10.—LOCAL KRATER, LEVEL III.

use are of shapes ultimately based on Greek models, and in those of finer quality the lustrous black pigment of the Greek potter is successfully imitated, and the ornament also is classical in character. In no case is there any attempt to copy the red-figured vases of the time, decoration being confined to floral motives in black on a light ground; the treatment is not quite Greek, but the inspiration is unmistakable. The best example of such a borrowed style is MN. 133 (Fig. 10), a faithful imitation of a column krater with a design of ivy sprays; but all the little oenochoe and lecythi, simple as they are, are in form derived from Attic originals (Fig. 11).

Level II. The destruction by fire of a large part of the town resulted in the building of Level II on identical lines; the debris of the ruined buildings raised the floor-levels by (in places) over a metre, a fact which accounts for the good preservation of Level III, but the walls must have been standing well over that height, and it was therefore easy to repair them, or at any rate to follow their lines. The general effect produced by the ruins is that they were less good than the old, but that is probably due as much to the fact that they are relatively ill preserved as to anything else; the occasional lack of proper foundations to the walls is explained by their being based on the walls of the level below, and although such things as the drains along the streets are definitely not so good, it must be allowed that a patched work—and the new drains are the old drains adapted to a higher level—never looks as well as the original construction. Against appearances of this sort we must set the fact that in Level II there was a much more free use of cement, especially in the floors of the magazines, and that most of the ashlar stone comes in this level; moreover, such inscriptions on stone as we found belong to this phase, and so does our one example of large-scale sculpture, a much-damaged but still fine marble head of a city goddess in Hellenistic style (Fig. 12); on the whole it would seem that the latter part of the fourth century B.C. showed no falling-off of the prosperity attained by the port during the great days of the Athenian Empire. So far as we can tell the trade of the place was still predominantly with Athens throughout most of the time represented by Level II, but undoubtedly it must have expanded greatly after the conquest of North Syria by Alexander. The Macedonian coins now oust those of Athens as the normal currency; the marble head just mentioned witnesses to the embellishment of the town after the conquest, and it must have seemed to its inhabitants as if a new era of development had begun.

Actually the reverse was the case. Some half-dozen copper coins of the Diadochi, the marble head mentioned above and a single clay vase which can definitely be called Hellenistic, alone testify to the existence of the place after Alexander's death. In 301 B.C. Seleucus Nikator founded his new great port of Seleucia, with its artificial basins and splendid buildings, and faced with such rivalry the old harbour at the river's mouth could not hold its own; it simply ceased to exist. The end, indeed, comes so suddenly that it scarcely looks natural, and it is likely that Seleucus forcibly removed the population of al Mina to his new foundation. It is significant that of the two principal gods of Seleucia one was Zeus Kasios. Zeus Kasios, so named after the mountain Kasios at whose foot al Mina lies, would

necessarily have been the patron deity of the old port but could scarcely have anything to do with Seleucia on the flank of Gebel Musa (Ῥωσικός



FIG. 11.—LOCAL LEKYTHI, LEVEL III.

Σκόπελος), the rival mountain, and if he was worshipped at Seleucia, his cult would seem to have been transferred there artificially with the



FIG. 12.—MARBLE HEAD OF CITY GODDESS, LEVEL II.

migration of his worshippers to their new home. The migration would have been the more easily effected because the old port can scarcely have recovered from a serious disaster; in 313 B.C. Ptolemy captured and sacked

Ποσίδειον καὶ Ποταμούς Καρῶν;²⁷ but whether the reason was partly political or wholly economic, the fact remains that the old harbour closed down completely and its site remained virtually unoccupied until mediaeval times.

It is difficult to exaggerate the historical importance of a trade-route which short-circuited the laborious land-passage through Anatolia, bringing Greece and Asia into direct contact, and of a harbour which certainly for five centuries, and probably for more than a thousand years, served as an open door between East and West; it is the more astonishing therefore that we should not know its name and have no literary record of its existence.

No inscription was found in the course of our excavations to throw light upon this point, and we are obliged to fall back upon probabilities. Personally I am of the opinion that we must take the al Mina and the Sabouni sites together as forming a unit such as I have described above, a unit consisting of the commercial harbour and the fortified hill-town in which the merchants lived, and must identify this with the Posidium of classical writers. Posidium (Posideïum) has generally been identified with Basit, and if I prefer a different identification, I must give my grounds for doing so.

The main argument in favour of Basit has been drawn from the itineraries. Unfortunately the figures in these are corrupt, and of those germane to the present issue every one has been arbitrarily emended by modern authors to suit what they have considered to be the geographical necessities, and they could with equal justification be emended to suit any other site on the neighbourhood. It is not safe to deduce from the itineraries any more than that Posidium lay between Seleucia and Laodicia (Lattakia); any closer identification must depend on other evidence. The most important is that of Herodotus which defines the fifth satrapy of the Persian Empire as 'the country reaching from the city of Posideïum (built by Amphiloehus, son of Amphiaräus, on the confines of Syria and Cilicia) to the borders of Egypt. . . . All Phoenicia, Syria and Cyprus were herein contained.'²⁸ No administrator organising a provincial system here would have made Basit his point of departure. That Cilicia should include both shores of the Gulf of Alexandretta is natural enough, but granted that, the real boundary to the south is the Ras al Khanzir; the Orontes is Syrian from its source to its mouth, and to have attributed Sueidia to Cilicia while keeping Aleppo and all the country south of the anti-Taurus in Syria would have been the crassest folly, for it would have deprived North Syria of its only outlet to the sea, and would have placed in the satrapy of Cilicia an area isolated from it by almost trackless mountains and economically useless to a province which already possessed the harbours of Arsus (Rhosus) in the east and Tarsus and Soli in the east. An administrative frontier

²⁷ For Ποταμούς Καρῶν Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, p. 419, suggests with good reason Ποταμούς Ὑδάτων, which was the old name of Seleucia according to Strabo xvi. 2. 8. The name Seleucia was first introduced in 301–300 B.C., but there had clearly been an earlier settlement on the site. According to the Gurob Papyrus Holleaux in

BCH 1906, pp. 330–348). Ptolemy III Euergetes in 247 B.C. again captured the fortified position of Posidium as a base for his attack on Seleucia: this Φρουρίον I take to be the hill-town at Sabouni, which may well have been maintained after the abandonment of the harbour.

²⁸ Herod. III. 91, Rawlinson's translation.

running through Basit is therefore in the last degree improbable. There are no historical reasons for supposing that the name ' Cilicia ' was ever applied to a district so far south as Sueidia, whereas the Alexandretta region was so named; as I have said, the real boundary was the rocky promontory of the Ras al Khanzir, and before the foundation of Seleucia the only seaboard town immediately south of this frontier was our port and walled city of al Mina and Sabouni; al Mina on the south and Arsus on the north of the range are properly described as being ' on the confines of Syria and Cilicia,' and no other place answers to the description.

Herodotus makes it clear that his Posideïum was flourishing in the fifth century B.C. As I have already pointed out, Basit, owing to its inaccessibility from the interior, could not have been a harbour of any importance until its immediate hinterland of mountain and forest was redeemed for civilisation, *i.e.*, until after the beginning of the Seleucid age, and its surface remains show nothing earlier than Roman; but the evidence of our excavations proves that in the fifth century the al Mina port was flourishing greatly. It would be strange indeed if in the itineraries Basit were mentioned and al Mina omitted, but if Posidium were really Basit that would be the case, for they mention no coastal town between Posidium and Seleucia; ²⁹ if, on the other hand, Posidium be equated with al Mina, it might be possible to identify Basit with Heraclea, which lay between Posidonia and Laodicea.³⁰ The fact that Heraclea was sometimes called Pieria would agree with the physical features of Basit (as the same term applied to Seleucia agrees with the character of the rocky slope on which it was built), but not at all with those of the Orontes' mouth.

If we accept, as seems inevitable, the emendation suggested by C. Müller of ' Posidonia ' for ' Sidonia ' in the *Stadiasmos* ³¹ we have a topographical note which seems highly relevant. Above the town ' is a high mountain called " The Throne " . ' It is recorded that both Hadrian and Julian when going to Seleucia first landed not at the great harbour itself but at the mouth of the Orontes, and climbed Mount Kasios in order to visit the sanctuary of its summit, and it is difficult not to correlate the place of pilgrimage with the ' Throne,' in which case Posidium must lie not under the Ras al Basit, but at the Orontes' mouth.

Priscian's mention of Posidium—Laodicen pariter positam prope littus amoenum, Et Posidi turres, et Daphnes optima tempe ³²—as a geographical index does no more than show that it lay between Lattakia and Seleucia, which is true of both al Mina and Basit; his phrase ' Posidi turres ' would agree very well with the high rock fortress of Sabouni, and so would the description of Posidium as a Φρούριον given by the Gurob Papyrus, but mere agreement does not constitute strong evidence. A much

²⁹ The *Stadiasmos* does put Charadrus between them, but see the next note. Ptolemy V. iv. 2, enumerating the harbours of N. Syria, gives ' Seleucia, Posidium, Heraclea. Laodicea.'

³⁰ The site of Heraclea is unknown; it is described as being 100 stades south of Posidium and as the next harbour to the north of Laodicea, from which it was distant 20 stades; the figures in the *Stadiasmos* are

here obviously corrupt. According to Pliny, *H.N.* v. 17, the port of Charadrus lay between Posidium and Heraclea, in which case an identification of Heraclea with Basit could scarcely hold good.

³¹ *Stad. m. m.* 143; see Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, p. 421.

³² Priscian, *Perieg.* v. 856.

better argument can be based on the relative antiquity of the two sites. Herodotus describes Posideïum as having been founded by Amphiloehus, a pre-Homeric hero of the war of the Seven against Thebes, which, if not literally true, does at least imply the existence of a local legend assigning to it a date anterior to the Trojan war. This is certainly inconsistent with the little that we know about Basit. It is true that the material evidence recovered at al Mina does not take us so far back in time either, but the Mycenaean sherds found at Sabouni do more or less fulfil the requirements of the Herodotean legend, and what is true of Sabouni was true of al Mina also. If we can connect the port with the inland site of Atchana, where evidence is forthcoming of connexions with Minoan Crete, then the case for identifying al Mina with Posideïum becomes very strong; and we can do so, for the link is given by a legend current at Antioch and preserved by John Malalas,³³ which, as Sir Arthur Evans has pointed out, can hardly fail to refer to our site.³⁴ According to this, the Greek hero Kasos founded a settlement on the North Syrian coast (and in the Antioch region, since it is of that region that Malalas is writing) and peopled it with Cretans and Cypriotes, and having married a princess, Amyke, ruled the territory as king. Mount Kasios is named after the hero, and his town was presumably therefore somewhere at its foot; and the only ruins of a sea-coast town under the shadow of Mount Kasios are at al Mina, where we have found a Cypriote population (in our Level VIII) and have reason to suspect the Cretans; 'Amyke' is not properly, or primarily, a personal name at all, but means 'an inhabitant of the Amuk,'³⁵ i.e., of the plain in which stood the city now represented by Tal Atchana, where in the sixteenth century B.C. the painted pottery betrays Minoan relations. Tradition knew of an ancient connexion between Atchana and its neighbouring cities on the one hand and the coastal area under Mount Kasios on the other, and recalled their dealings with Crete and with Cyprus;³⁶ we have therefore literary evidence of the fact that the foundation of al Mina as a Greek settlement goes back to the heroic age, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that it and the Posideïum founded by Amphiloehus are one and the same.

LEONARD WOOLLEY.

London.

³³ Malalas, *Chronographia*, viii, 257 (Ed. Dindorf).

³⁴ Evans, *Palace of Minos*, IV, p. 781, citing Dussaud in *Syria*, x. (1929), pp. 301-3.

³⁵ In modern Arab parlance 'Am(u)ki; the name of the plain is spelt either *Amk* (which spelling I have used) or *Amuk*, as in the French maps. The name

is ancient, appearing in Assyrian texts. According to Malalas the Plain was named after the lady, but the reverse is equally probable.

³⁶ Cypriote Bronze Age pottery is common at Atchana.

ALCIBIADES, AGIS AND SPARTAN POLICY

I. SATYRUS ON ALCIBIADES

ATHENAEUS quotes from Satyrus a passage in which is described the remarkable facility shown by Alcibiades in adapting his way of life to his environment (*FHG* III, 160 = Athen. XII, 534b): περὶ δὲ τοῦ καλοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου Σάτυρος ἱστορῶν, λέγεται, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ μὲν ὧν Ἰώνων· ἐφαίνετο τρυφερώτερος, ἐν Θήβαις δὲ σωμασκῶν καὶ γυμναζόμενος τῶν Θηβαίων αὐτῶν μᾶλλον Βοιωτίας, ἐν Θετταλίᾳ δὲ ἵπποτροφῶν καὶ ἡνιοχῶν τῶν Ἀλευαδῶν ἵππικώτερος, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δὲ καρτερίαν καὶ ἀφέλειαν ἐπιτηδεύων ἐνίκᾳ τοὺς Λάκωνας, ὑπερῆρεν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν Θρακῶν ἀκρατοποσίαν. This chameleon-like quality of Alcibiades is also stressed by other writers, who, however, in cataloguing the localities in which he displayed his adaptability, differ somewhat from one another and from Satyrus. Plutarch (*Alcib.* 23, 5) mentions Sparta, Ionia, Thrace, the court of Tissaphernes;¹ in another passage (*Mor.* 52e) Athens, Sparta, Thrace, the court of Tissaphernes; Nepos (*Alcib.* 11, 2) gives Athens, Thebes, Sparta, Thrace, the Persian Empire; Aelian (*V.H.* IV, 15) gives Sparta, Boeotia, Thessaly, the court of Pharnabazus. Now Athenaeus, in the passage where he quotes the above fragment of Satyrus, is evidently following a collection of anecdotes about Alcibiades (XII, 534-5, where he cites several other authors), and very probably Plutarch, Nepos, and Aelian derive their material from similar compilations, which were extensively used by writers of the Roman period; but, since *florilegia* on Alcibiades must have been numerous, it is not to be assumed that all are copying from the same *florilegium*. Hence considerable variation of phrase and arrangement is not unnatural. Yet these passages must depend ultimately upon a single original, but this original is older than Satyrus, who indicates that his words are a quotation (λέγεται). Satyrus, writing in the last years of the third century B.C., belongs to an age when collections of extracts were being compiled but had scarcely come into general use, and he doubtless had access to the work in which these sentiments on Alcibiades were originally expressed. This work cannot be identified with certainty, but it must have been written before the middle of the third century, and is probably the *Hellenica* of Theopompus.² From Nepos it is known that

¹ Earlier editors emended the text to include Thessaly, but this emendation has rightly been abandoned in the latest Teuber text of Lindskog and Ziegler. Certainly the balance of the sentence is improved by the insertion of (ἐν Θετταλοῖς), and these words may well have stood in the original which Plutarch has followed; but, as I shall suggest below, he has deliberately omitted mention of

Thessaly. This omission, though destroying the balance of the sentence, does not seriously damage the sense, for interest in horses was scarcely less characteristic of the Thracians than of the Thessalians.

² Satyrus must have been familiar with the works of Theopompus, for much of the material in his life of Philip, particularly the domestic details (*FHG* III, 161), would be drawn from the *Philippica*.

Theopompus dealt in some detail with the character of Alcibiades,³ and, since Nepos follows this statement with his version of Alcibiades' adaptability, it seems that the whole of his chapter (ch. 11) is derived from a *florilegium* whose substance was drawn largely from the *Hellenica*.^{3a} Further, the Satyrus fragment—both the material and its presentation—is strongly reminiscent of the distinctive and somewhat exaggerated method of character-sketching employed by Theopompus. The character-studies of Lysander in the *Hellenica* (fr. 21, Oxford) and of Philip in the *Philippica* (fr. 26) exemplify this method^{3b} and are closely parallel to the passage under discussion. It cannot perhaps be claimed that this study of Alcibiades as it stands in the text of Athenaeus after passing through the hands of three copyists is an entirely accurate quotation from the *Hellenica*, but at least this would seem to be the primary authority upon which subsequent tradition depends.

The Satyrus fragment refers to a visit to Thessaly which is not included by Plutarch or Nepos, and to a visit to Thebes which is not included by Plutarch. According to Busolt (*Gr. Gesch.* III, 2, 1328n.), these visits are unhistorical, being inserted only to complete the picture of Alcibiades' versatility; while Nepos, in another passage (*Alcib.* 4, 4), in which he records the movements of Alcibiades after his return from Sicily, has substituted Thebes for Argos (Isocr. XVI, 9; Plut. *Alcib.* 23, 1) because the Argives had no distinctive characteristics which might be imitated. This is a most unconvincing hypothesis. It is far more probable that in adapting the original passage, which he found in a collection of extracts, Plutarch has omitted Thessaly and Thebes from the list because the authorities upon which his life of Alcibiades depends supplied no further information concerning visits to these localities;⁴ and Nepos has omitted Thessaly for similar reasons.

Can it be determined at what date and with what object these journeys were undertaken? It is, of course, arguable that Alcibiades visited Thessaly and Thebes in his youth, but the Satyrus fragment seems to refer exclusively to the later stages of his career, when he was already a famous personage.⁵ It is also possible to accept the statement of Nepos that he travelled to Thebes from Elis immediately after his return from Sicily, but the arrangement of Nepos' *Lives* is not strictly chronological, and the evidence of

³ Fr. 286, Oxford = Nepos, *Alcib.* 11. He would naturally include a character-study of Alcibiades in the *Hellenica* when recording his death. Alternatively, the passage may possibly be derived from the digression on Athenian demagogues in Book X of the *Philippica*. Timaeus is also mentioned by Nepos in the same sentence, but he had less reason to be interested in the later stages of Alcibiades' career.

^{3a} The reference to his life at Athens may originate from a passage in Thucydides (VI, 15).

^{3b} Theopompus describes the inhabitants of districts or cities in a similar way: cf. fr. 51, 153 (Thessaly), and 65 (Byzantium and Chalcedon). On his 'exaggeratedly antithetical manner,' see Wormell, *Jale Class. Stud.* v, 66.

⁴ If, as will be suggested below, these visits belong to 413, Theopompus would not mention them in their chronological setting, but refer incidentally to them in his character-study. Thus Plutarch's main authority, perhaps a Hellenistic biographer relying on Thucydides and Theopompus, would know nothing of them.

⁵ Hiller von Gaertringen, *RE* VI A col. 121, rightly believes that his Thessalian visit belongs to his exile, but the passage which he cites from Diogenes Laertius (II, 5, 9 = II, 25) as evidence of relations between Alcibiades and certain Thessalian nobles surely cannot bear this interpretation. The sojourn in Thrace belongs, of course, to the last years of his life.

Thucydides, while not altogether precluding a visit to Thebes at this time, seems strongly against it. Alcibiades was recalled from Sicily shortly before the end of the summer of 415 (VI, 61) and, after his escape at Thurii and voyage to Cyllene, was invited to Sparta (*ibid.* 88, 9) where he delivered his momentous speech before the winter of 415-14 was very far advanced.⁶ There is, on the other hand, some indication that his visits to Thebes and to Thessaly belong to the period in which he is believed to have remained inactive at Sparta, and were in fact made in his unofficial capacity as diplomatic agent of the Spartan government.

II. ALCIBIADES AT SPARTA

Thucydides supplies no information concerning the fortunes of Alcibiades at Sparta subsequent to the delivery of his speech, noting only that he continued to advocate the fortification of Decelea (VII, 18, 1). This silence is natural enough, for the historian is not interested in biographical detail and, moreover, his narrative of the Sicilian expedition has a strongly monographic character which leads him to reduce to a minimum his references to contemporaneous events in Greece. Accordingly the earliest biographers of Alcibiades could find little to fill this gap of more than two years, and this dearth of material is reflected in the account of Plutarch (*Alcib.* 23). The extant evidence, as it stands, suggests the following picture: as soon as Alcibiades arrived at Sparta, he made a speech which so impressed the authorities that they promptly adopted one of his main suggestions—and with striking success; he then lingered on for two idle years without exercising any marked influence upon Spartan policy (*cf.* Plut. *Comp. Alc. Cor.* 2, 9) until, finally, his mission to Chios terminated this idleness. Although Sparta was not the city to afford an exile much scope for political activities, such conduct can scarcely be reconciled with the dynamic energy which he displayed at all other stages of his career, with the exception of his closing years, when he had lost the confidence of all parties and had become embittered. The envy felt by the more prominent Spartans towards him in 412 seems to have been cumulative, and not merely the outcome of his recent exploits in Ionia (Plut. *Alcib.* 24, 3, *cf.* Nepos *Alcib.* 5, 1 and Justin V, 2, 5). But more decisive is the evidence of his own speech, in which he urges the Spartan government to make practical use of his services (Thuc. VI, 92, 5, ἐμοί τε ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐς κίνδυνον καὶ ἐς τάλαιπωρίαν πᾶσαν ἀδεῶς χρῆσθαι), for Thucydides would hardly have put these words into his mouth if his offer had only been accepted two and a half years later. There are reasons, which will presently be stated, for believing that, far from remaining idle, he was engaged in a complex political game and was the *de facto* director of Spartan foreign policy. In many cases, no doubt, all record of his activities has

⁶ Isocrates and Plutarch (*cf.* above) state that he was at Argos before he went to Sparta, but this is most improbable, for a democracy hostile to his friends was at this time in power at Argos (Thuc. VI, 61, 3), and this democracy was the ally of Athens

and the enemy of Sparta (*ibid.* 95 and 105). There is probably some confusion with visits to Argos at the beginning of his career (V, 55, 4 and 84, 1) or with the movements of Themistocles when he too was an exile (I, 135, 3; Plut. *Them.* 23, 1).

been lost, since Thucydides did not choose to mention them, but it is possible to suggest one scheme—apart from his share in the occupation of Decelea—by which, in collaboration with a Spartan king, he sought to serve the city of his adoption (see below III).

His relationship with Agis, the only notable figure at Sparta in these years, is obscured by the tiresome *Skandalgeschichte*, which represents him as the seducer of the king's wife and the father of Leotychidas. The authenticity of this story has long been challenged,⁷ and a recent examination of the evidence stresses its weaknesses.⁸ The claim that Leotychidas was not Agis' son is highly suspect, being put forward by Lysander, who was anxious to substitute Agesilaus on the throne; and the identification of Alcibiades with the queen's alleged lover, which is unknown to Xenophon and is chronologically irreconcilable with his version (*Hell.* III, 3, 1–3, *cf.* Luria, *op. cit.* 408–9), seems to have originated from the romantic imagination of the untrustworthy Duris (*Plut. Ages.* 3, 2). The impatience of law and convention displayed by Alcibiades involved him in innumerable slanders,⁹ and, just as suspicion fell upon him after the mutilation of the Hermae, so in later times, because a story was current that Timaea had been unfaithful, he was believed to have been her lover. And the well-known quarrel between Agis and Alcibiades afforded a convenient peg upon which to hang this accusation.

Thucydides does not record the circumstances which led to this hostility, merely stating that in the summer of 412 they were already enemies (VIII, 12, 2, *cf.* 45, 1). Plutarch gives two reasons (*Alcib.* 24, 3): first, the seduction of Timaea, and, secondly, the jealousy felt by Agis for the very high reputation of Alcibiades. The latter reason alone has any historical foundation, and indeed the king had every justification for complaining that the value of his own solid achievement had been obscured by the genius of an unscrupulous partner. The foundations of this partnership were laid before Alcibiades had been long resident at Sparta. Agis was a soldier of distinction, and possessed great energy (*Thuc.* VII, 27, 4) and ambition, but he obviously lacked the qualities of an enlightened statesman. Though inclined to be autocratic (V, 60, 1; VIII, 5, 3), and therefore perhaps slow to adopt the plans of others, he appreciated the wisdom of Alcibiades' suggestion that a permanent base should be occupied in Attica, and he clearly hoped that, if he were to lead the expedition in person and to remain at Decelea in command of the garrison, the credit would be his. When in the spring of 413—the Athenians had supplied a *casus belli* by raiding Spartan territory (VI, 105) and their forces in Sicily were already in difficulties—Decelea was fortified, it is noteworthy that Alcibiades accompanied the Spartan army.¹⁰ Clearly he and Agis were at this moment working in close collaboration, each hoping to use the

⁷ Niese, *RE* I, col. 818; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* I, 2, 188. It is still accepted by Ferguson, *CAH* V, 314, Glotz, *Histoire grecque* II, 717, and Ehrenberg, *RE* VI A, col. 1075.

⁸ Luria, *Klio* xxi (1927), 404–12. From a story told by Plutarch (*Mor.* 227a) it would appear that Agis was on the best of terms with his wife when

he returned from Decelea.

⁹ Many specimens are found in works as early as Lysias XIV and [Andocides] IV.

¹⁰ Diod. XIII, 9, 2. The account of Diodorus (Ephorus) is not wholly dependent on Thucydides, and there is no reason to discredit this statement. Plutarch (*Alcib.* 23, 7) would date the seduction of

qualities of the other for selfish ends. How is it, then, that in 412 they had become bitter adversaries? An answer to this question may be found by examining the meagre record of the events of the intervening months.

III. THE NORTHERN PLAN.

In the late autumn of 413 Agis marched northward from Decelea with an army. After collecting funds from the allied states for the building of a fleet, he supplemented this sum by plundering the Oetaeans, who had long been hostile to Sparta. In spite of strong protests from Thessaly, he also extracted money and hostages from the Phthiotid Achaeans and 'the other subjects of the Thessalians in this district,'¹¹ and tried to draw these peoples into the Spartan alliance. Thus Thucydides (VIII, 3, 1) summarises the results of this expedition, confining himself to its immediate effect upon the Spartan naval plan; but it may well be doubted whether his account adequately represents the aims or even the achievement of Agis, especially as this chapter falls in the least satisfactory and complete section of the historian's work. A Spartan king did not take the field in person unless engaged in some enterprise of importance, and the income which would accrue from levying tribute upon the petty tribes of the Spercheius valley and the mountaineers of Achaea could scarcely bring a very substantial addition to the naval fund. Further, it is known from Aristophanes (*Lysistr.* 1169) that the shores of the Malian Gulf, together with Echinus, which commanded its northern entrance, remained in Spartan hands. The activities of Agis in this area must have included the re-establishment of Spartan control over the important outpost at Heraclea,^{11a} which Thucydides surprisingly fails to mention at this point. Since 419 Heraclea had been held by the Boeotians, who in that year expelled an incompetent Spartan officer and substituted a garrison of their own troops, thereby evoking great resentment at Sparta (Thuc. V, 52, 1). General relations between the Spartan and Boeotian governments were far from cordial for some years after the Peace of Nicias, and in 413 the task of inducing the Boeotians to renounce their claim to Heraclea in favour of Sparta must have presented considerable difficulties. Here was an opportunity to enlist the diplomatic gifts of Alcibiades, who in this year was with Agis at Decelea. It seems very probable that his visit to Thebes, which is mentioned in the Satyrus passage as well as by Nepos and Aelian, was undertaken in connexion with these negotiations, and that in the course of the summer he proceeded from Decelea to Thebes to pave the way for the king's proposed expedition to the north. This, indeed, was the first step of an ambitious project planned by Alcibiades and Agis, which they were beginning to execute at the time of the Athenian catastrophe in Sicily.

Timaea during the absence of Agis on a campaign which must be that of Decelea; but, even if the story had any foundation, this dating is inconsistent with another statement of Plutarch (*Agis.* 3, 1), namely, that the seduction took place very soon after

the arrival of Alcibiades at Sparta.

¹¹ These must be small tribes on the southern borders of Thessaly such as the Aenianians.

^{11a} In 410 a Spartan harmost was in charge of the colony (*Xen. Hell.* I, 2, 18).

Now, in describing the foundation of Heraclea in 426, Thucydides states that the Spartans planned to establish a naval station with docks on the nearby shore of the Malian Gulf, whence they could conduct operations against Euboea (III, 92, 4-6). It can scarcely be a coincidence that at the time of Agis' northern expedition Athens was feeling uneasiness concerning the fidelity of the Euboeans (VIII, 1, 3), who presently sent an embassy to him at Decelea (*ibid.* 5, 1), and that Sparta was again entertaining naval ambitions. The arrival of these envoys was a direct consequence of Agis' activities, and, if he had sent troops to the island, as he at first intended, Sparta could both have threatened the food-supply of Athens, of which some part was derived from Euboea (VII, 28, 1, *cf.* VIII, 96, 2), and have gained free access to the northern waters of the Aegean. But the subjugation of Achaia Phthiotis and neighbouring districts shows that Agis had aims in another direction. The second motive which Thucydides attributes to the Spartans in founding Heraclea was to facilitate the passage of armies to Chalcidice (III, 92, 4), and the colony proved useful as a halting-place. However, the hostility of the Thessalians remained a serious obstacle, for, although the resourceful Brasidas had evaded them (IV, 78), two subsequent reinforcements were unable to reach him owing to Thessalian opposition (IV, 132; V, 13, 1). In 413 the Spartans may well have been eager to reopen the land-route to Thrace. The predominating influence of Athens in Chalcidice had been impaired by the exploits of Brasidas, and her persistent efforts to regain control of this timber-producing district illustrates its importance in Athenian eyes.¹² As recently as the winter of 416-15 Sparta had tried to induce the Chalcidians to resume hostilities with Athens; this attempt failed (VI, 7, 4), but in 413, thanks to Athenian embarrassments, prospects of success were very much brighter. Spartan intervention in Macedonia, an even richer source of timber, was equally imperative, especially as the enemies of Athens were preparing to build a fleet. To secure the Macedonian supply of timber and to prevent Athens from enjoying it was a necessity which Alcibiades doubtless impressed upon the Spartan authorities, and the disturbed condition of Macedonia suggested that this object might easily be attained. Perdicas, who after many bewildering changes of policy had assisted the Athenians in 414 (VII, 9), died in the course of the following year,¹³ and his successor Archelaus gained the throne only by murdering all other claimants. Macedonia was liable to be crippled by such dynastic struggles, and this must have seemed a most opportune moment for Spartan interference. Certainly the influence exerted by the Macedonian monarchy over the Thessalian aristocrats, which had once facilitated, and later prevented the passage of Spartan armies to Chalcidice, must for a time have been broken.

Here again the diplomatic skill of Alcibiades would be of great value to the Spartan government, and his visit to the Aleuadae, to which Satyrus refers, may well belong to the late summer or early autumn of 413. At this time Thessaly was weak and disunited owing to the uneasy progress

¹² There is evidence of Athenian operations there in 418, 417, 416, 414, and even 412.

¹³ Beloch, *op. cit.* III, 2, 55.

of social development and the consequent decay of the national state, so that if a powerful faction such as the Aleuadae were persuaded to embrace the Spartan cause, the appearance of Agis with his army on the Thessalian border would probably draw the whole district into the Spartan alliance. The entire scheme, if the foregoing reconstruction be accepted—the development of Heraclea as a naval and military base, the winning of Thessaly, the extension of Spartan influence over Chalcidice and Macedonia—has a breadth of conception which suggests that it originated from the brain of Alcibiades. As in the fortification of Decelea, Agis lent the support of his authority and of his practical ability only because he expected thereby to benefit his country and at the same time to win distinction for himself.

That this far-reaching plan was abandoned when no more had been effected than the re-establishment of Heraclea and the subjugation of Achaia Phthiotis was due partly to miscalculation, but very largely to changes of circumstances. In the first place, the mission of Alcibiades was not sufficiently successful to enable the army of Agis to gain Thessaly. Perhaps the Aleuadae were convinced by Alcibiades' arguments,¹⁴ and caused him to believe that all Thessaly would follow their lead; but their influence had been weakened first by their discreditable association with Persia and later by the growth of democratic opposition, so that at the close of the century they did not enjoy undisputed control even over Larisa. At all events, the κοινόν remained unmoved in its passive fidelity to Athens, and showed its hostility to Sparta by strong protests against the operations of Agis in Achaia. Secondly, hopes of extending Spartan influence over the northern coasts of the Aegean were soon dispelled, for the accession of Archelaus, a man of far greater ability and determination than Perdiccas, served to strengthen rather than weaken Macedonia. He devoted the opening years of his reign to the consolidation of his position in the north, avoiding active participation in a conflict from which he could derive little benefit. There is evidence that he prudently favoured Athens, now the weaker of the combatants: in the winter of 413–12, while Agis was in the north, the Athenians procured timber from undefined sources, of which the most important was probably Macedonia (Thuc. VIII, 4; cf. Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 422); Andocides (II, 11) claims that in 411 he conveyed a cargo of oars from Archelaus to Samos; and an Athenian decree probably of 411–10 honours the Macedonian king for past and present services in connexion with the supplying of timber.¹⁵ The Spartans seem to have tried to gain his assistance against Athens, but he refused to aid them, and at the end of his reign was regarded as a highly dangerous enemy ([Herodes], *περὶ πολιτείας* 19 and 24). Thirdly, the scheme of Alcibiades had been conceived, and was being set in motion before the news of the Athenian

¹⁴ Some party in Thessaly still favoured Sparta early in 411, when Dercyllidas was able to lead a small army by the land-route to the Hellespont (Thuc. VIII, 61, 1). On the other hand, in 400 the Aleuadae supported Archelaus and opposed the proposal to welcome Spartan intervention at Larisa (Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.*, p. 55).

¹⁵ *IG* i², 105, 24–31. Whatever the date of this inscription may be (Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents*, 109–15, and *Class. Stud. presented to E. Capps*, 246–52; De Sanctis, *Riv. Fil.* 1935, 206–7), it certainly suggests that Archelaus supplied the Athenians with timber from the beginning of his reign.

disaster in Sicily became known in Greece. At first this event seemed likely to facilitate its execution, which was accordingly pressed forward with enthusiasm during the autumn; but in the course of the winter it became clear that, whereas the support of Thessaly and Macedonia was not to be won so easily as had been anticipated, several of the more powerful members of the Delian Confederacy were now prepared to revolt if they received aid from the Peloponnese. Hence the northern plan was abandoned as soon as Agis had tested the attitude of Thessaly. This failure dissolved the partnership between him and Alcibiades and gave rise to their subsequent enmity, each holding the other responsible for the breakdown of the scheme. Henceforward each strove to make the expected downfall of Athens his own achievement and to obstruct by every means in his power the ambitions of his rival.

IV. THE EFFECTS OF THE QUARREL.

There is no doubt that, had the Spartan government taken full advantage of the Athenian disaster in Sicily, the maritime empire of Athens could have been permanently shattered within the next campaigning season. Failure to seize their opportunities was characteristic of the Spartans (Thuc. I, 70; VIII, 96, 5), but on this occasion the breach between Agis and Alcibiades certainly intensified their indecision. Lack of co-operation is especially noticeable in the treatment of embassies which were sent by several allies of Athens to declare their readiness to revolt. Envoys first from the Euboeans, whose decision must have been influenced by the re-establishment of Heraclea, and later from the Lesbians approached Agis at Decelea, and he prepared to support the appeal of the latter without consulting his home government.^{15a} His reputation had not been affected by his failure in the north, since the more ambitious sections of this plan had doubtless been kept secret, and he intended to make full use of the almost dictatorial powers which had been vested in him (VIII, 5, 3). That Agis should direct the Spartan offensive from his headquarters at Decelea was most distasteful to Alcibiades, who, after returning to Sparta, sought to undermine the king's autocracy by enlisting the authority of his friend Endius, now one of the ephors (*id.* 6, 3). The arrival at Sparta of envoys from Chios and Erythrae bringing with them an agent from Tissaphernes, who urged the dispatch of a Peloponnesian fleet to Asia and promised to provide for its maintenance,¹⁶ furthered the intrigues of Alcibiades, and afforded the opportunity both of frustrating Agis' plan to support the Lesbian revolt and of enhancing his own reputation by acting as negotiator between the satrap and the Spartans. It was disappointing that two Greek

^{15a} The Boeotians were partly responsible for persuading Agis to transfer his attention from Euboea to Lesbos, and even promised ships (VIII, 5, 2). Although support of Lesbos was their traditional policy (III, 2, 3 and 13, 1), they may at the same time have felt that the extension of Spartan influence over central Greece under his direction was likely to damage their interests.

¹⁶ Thucydides (*ibid.* 5, 4) stresses the fact that the envoys negotiated with the Spartan government and not with Agis. Since Alcibiades was friendly with the authorities at Miletus before the revolt of that city (*ibid.* 17, 2), it is possible that he was in communication with Ionia in the winter of 413-12 and that these envoys came to Sparta at his suggestion.

exiles should appear at Sparta about this time bearing a similar offer from Pharnabazus, for this offer, combined with that of the Lesbians, might be preferred to the alternative proposal of Chios and Tissaphernes. However, the authorities were swayed by Alcibiades and Endius, who advanced the decisive argument that Chios possessed a navy of sixty ships.

At the beginning of 412 the Spartans hastened to execute this design, which was ratified at a conference of the allies held at Corinth. Agis, who was present at this meeting, found that his decision to answer the Lesbian appeal had been postponed (*ibid.* 8, 1-2), but he offered no opposition, believing that, as the allied navy was regarded as his creation, he would be credited with all the successes which it might win in whatever sphere (*ibid.* 9, 1; *cf.* 12, 2 and 17, 2). He cannot have been aware that Alcibiades was responsible for the acceptance of the Chian appeal, while the decision to send the latter to Ionia with Chalcideus and the small Spartan section of the allied fleet seems to have been an afterthought (*ibid.* 6, 5 and 11, 3). That the twenty-one allied ships which started for Chios from the Isthmus were forced ashore on the Peloponnesian coast was indeed fortunate for Alcibiades. The ephors were discouraged by this *débâcle*, but he convinced them that, if he and Chalcideus were to sail at once with the Spartan squadron, he could organise a general revolt in Ionia. At the same time Endius was persuaded in private conversations that his own interests would be better served if the Ionian cities were to revolt and the support of Persia be won through the agency of his friend and protégé, than if these objects were effected by the fleet of Agis, whom they both hated (*ibid.* 12).

The difficulty of understanding the tangled events of the following months is largely due to the unrevised condition of Thucydides' narrative, but historians have added to their difficulties by failing to appreciate the extent to which the situation in Asia was affected by the private ambitions of Alcibiades. At the outset, while he held a virtually independent command, he applied himself with his usual energy to the prosecution of the revolt, and his efforts were strikingly successful. Later, even though allowance be made for the unexpected resoluteness of Athenians and the incompetence of the Spartan commanders, the ill-success of the Spartan cause is very remarkable. Even the Chians, who had been so eager to revolt, lost their enthusiasm, and it seemed that a pro-Athenian faction might gain control of the government (*ibid.* 24, 6 and 38, 3). An incidental remark of Thucydides—unfortunately it is not further explained—that Alcibiades was suspected by the Spartans from the time of the battle at Miletus is highly significant (*ibid.* 45, 1), for it was on the evening after this battle that the main fleet of the allies, including a Sicilian squadron, arrived off the Asiatic coast. He would appear to have served the Spartans well on this occasion (*ibid.* 26, 1-3), but some unrecorded action on his part evidently roused their suspicions. As soon as he learned that the fleet collected by Agis was at last approaching, he must have changed his policy, realising that he had nothing further to gain by serving Sparta in a subordinate capacity. His intrigues with Tissaphernes had already begun, and it was with good reason that the Spartans held him responsible

for the difficulties experienced by their admirals in extracting subsidies from the satrap. In the autumn Ēndius and his colleagues were succeeded by a board of ephors who supported Agis and were determined to end the mismanagement of the war in Asia (Glotz, *op. cit.* 715–16). Soon a dispatch was received ordering the execution of Alcibiades, but he had already fled to the court of Tissaphernes and permanently severed his connexion with the Spartan government.¹⁷

H. D. WESTLAKE.

*King's College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

¹⁷ Since this paper was written, a fragment of an unnamed comic poet has come to my notice in which Alcibiades is accused of adultery (Athen. XIII, 574d, ἀλλ' Ἀλκιβιάδην τὸν ἄβρὸν, ὧ γῆ καὶ θεοί, | δὲ ἡ Λακεδαιμῶν μοιχὸν ἐπιθυμεῖ λαβεῖν). The story that Alcibiades was Timaea's lover perhaps owes its origin to these lines; for an ingenious writer, such as Duris, reading this passage and remembering the dispute over the

legitimacy of Leotychidas, might well be tempted to combine two scandals which were in fact wholly unconnected. It is also possible that the comic poet is referring figuratively to the transference of Alcibiades' political affections from Sparta to Persia, and that some historian, as often happened when comedy was used as an authority, made the mistake of too literal interpretation.

A GROUP OF PLASTIC VASES¹

[PLATE V.]

Pl. V, 1 and 2 shows a plastic vase in the British Museum, in the form of an antelope's head, cut off flat at the base of the neck and with the orifice in the right ear. The clay is light reddish-brown with a very smooth surface, the glaze brownish-black. The horns, ears, eyelids, pupils, muzzle and outlines of jaws are black, the face is covered with fine black dots, the neck and throat and the burr of the horns with short black strokes; there are white dots on the muzzle, red in the interior of ears and nostrils, and an incised line round the pupils. Under the base is a black rosette with a white dot on each petal (Pl. V, 2). Horns and ears are broken off, but are preserved complete on a replica in Berlin² (Fig. 1, *a* and Pl. V, 3). Mlle. Maximova pointed out the connexion of the two vases, though she wrongly stated that the London vase had no orifice.³ She mentioned two others with the orifice in the ear—a bull's head in Berlin⁴ and a ram's head in Florence,⁵ both also cut off flat at the neck. The bull's head has no other resemblance to the antelopes', but the ram's appears from the description to be of similar style. The main peculiarity of the painting of the antelopes' heads—the covering of some areas with fine dots and others with short dashes—recurs on a number of other vases. I list the examples known to me:

A. Heads cut off flat at the neck with the orifice in the ear.

1. London, 47. 11-27. 10 (old no. A 1151). Antelope's head; described above. H. 8 cm. From Italy, probably the northern part; purchased with objects from Chiusi, Siena and Elba. Plate V, 1 and 2.

2. Berlin, 1340. See above. Antelope's head. H. 13 cm. Replica of 1 except that on the flat base is painted a bridled horse's head. Gerhard Collection. Fig. 1*a* and Plate V, 3.

3. Florence. Ram's head; see above. Known to me only from Maximova's description. From Chiusi.

¹ I have to thank the authorities of the Berlin, Boston, Wurzburg and British Museums for photographs and permission to publish them; Dr. Caskey also for very kindly sending me information about the Boston vases, and Miss Richte for information about, and a photograph of, the vase in New York.

² 1340. Maximova, *Les Vases Plastiques* pl. XXIII, no. 94, and pp. 124 f., 175. The peculiar convention of the joined horns, making a loop to hang the vase up by, is evidently a rendering of a lyrate form in the original; cf. the bronze horns, *Olympia* IV, pl. LVII, 977. This and the long boot

face are typical of certain gazelles and antelopes found in Arabia and Africa; cf. the *δπος* mentioned by Herodotus, IV, 192, as inhabiting Eastern Libya, whose horns were used to make frames for lyres. The *δρυξ*, also apparently an antelope, was believed by Aristotle (*H.A.* 499 *b* 20. *P.A.* 663 *a* 23) to have only one horn in the centre of its forehead. Perhaps our creatures also have a place in the ancestry of the unicorn.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 125, n. 1.

⁴ 1302. *op. cit.* pl. XXIII, no. 93, and pp. 123, 175.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 119 f.

4. Würzburg. Langlotz, 150, pl. 18. Boar's head. L. 12.7 cm. Black: dots on snout, dashes on face and neck, eyebrows, lines round mouth and on crest, outside of ears; white: tusks, irises, dots on rims of ears; red: crest, pupils, interior of ears and nostrils; incision for eyebrows, lines round mouth and on throat. On ridge of crest white crenelation with red dots; on flat area elaborate black rosette with red and white details. Feoli collection. Pl. V, 4 and 5, and Fig. 3.

B. Full figures (except 9) with aryballos mouth on top of head.

5. Würzburg. Langlotz, 148, pl. 18. Maximova, pp. 96, 172. Swimming duck. L. 15 cm. Black: head, wings, tail, dots on neck, breast and belly, dashes on legs; white: tail-feathers, dots on head and wings; red: beak, tail-feathers; incision for wing- and tail-feathers. Vase-mouth black with incised star, and on rim white crenelation with red dots. Feoli Collection.

6. London, B 666. Maximova, p. 96. L. 12 cm. As last but without black dots; incision only for eye. White also for wing-feathers. Vase-mouth and most of beak missing. From S. Maria di Capua.

6a. New York, Metropolitan Museum 13.225.11. Formerly Borelli Bey Collection (Cat. Vente 211, Pl. xix). Maximova, p. 75, n. 3. Swimming duck. As 5, but black all over; incision for wing- and tail-feathers, scale-pattern on neck, breast, upper part of wings and belly, hatching on legs, and contours of eye and beak: red for upper surface of beak, circle round eye, and alternate wing- and tail-feathers: white dots on head. The vase-mouth and tip of the wings are missing (mouth falsely restored in Borelli Bey Catalogue). The Borelli Bey Collection was formed in Alexandria, but contained objects from Greece and Italy. This complete black-polychrome decoration is unparalleled in this series, but the form, with much of the decoration, is identical with that of 5 and 6, and there is no doubt that it belongs here.

7. Vatican. Albizzati, 120, pl. 9. Maximova, pl. XIX, no. 76, and p. 96. Sleeping duck. L. 9.2 cm. Head, neck, breast and belly reserved; black: wings, tail, eyes and circle of dots round them, dashes on legs; white: dots on wings, wing- and tail-feathers; red: tail-feathers. Vase-mouth black with incised tongues, and on rim white crenelation with red dots. Probably from Etruria (Maximova).

8. Boston. Fairbanks, 517, pl. 51. Standing owl. H. 9 cm. Head and breast reserved; black: eyes and circles of dots round them, eyebrows extended into huge spirals, upper part of wings, feathers on lower part and on brow, dashes on legs; red: beak; white: dots on upper part of wings, feathers on lower part; incised lines round pupils. Vase-mouth, detached but apparently relevant, black with incised loops. Fig. 1, c.

9. Boston. Fairbanks, 518, pl. 51. H. 9.3 cm. Monkey 'protome'—a monkey's head set on a tall cylindrical member like the necks of the antelopes 1 and 2. Black: dots on head and face, dashes on 'neck,' pupils and lids; red: interior of ears; incised line round pupils. On base black rosette with white details, just as on 1, but without central blob. Vase-mouth reserved with tongues, and on rim short strokes alternately black and red or white. Fig. 1, b.

C. Aidoion vase.

10. London, Witt 442. H. 11 cm. Member broken off. Half vase-mouth and neck in relief behind, turning into division of scrotum. Black: dots on scrotum, dashes for pubic hair, edge of pubes, edge of vase-mouth and neck, rosettes on either side of vase-neck; white, centres of rosettes, dot-rosette on vase-neck; white crenelation with red dots on edge of pubes, white strokes and red dots on edge of vase-mouth. Two suspension holes (Fig. 2).

The three groups are united by the character of their painting, and 9 makes a link between the forms of A and B. The last also recalls wheel-made vases with modelled heads.

Two other types can be associated with the vases listed above, though they do not show the full dot-and-dash technique:

D. *Dead Hares.*

11. Vatican. Albizzati, 117, pl. 9; Maximova, pl. XXII, 88, and pp. 110, 175. L. 27 cm. Hung by front paws, head down back, aryballos-mouth rising from throat. Black: rims of ears, dots all over except belly; red: interior of ears, eyes, under tail; white:



FIG. 1.—a, BERLIN 1340; b, BOSTON 518; c, BOSTON 517.

belly, flecks on rims of ears. Vase-mouth black with incised star, and on rim white zig-zag with red dots. From Cervetri.

12. Copenhagen. *CF* II, pl. 81, 14. L. 25 cm. Form as last; colouring also, but red only in ears, white also for eyes and teeth. Vase-mouth black with incised lotus-star, and on rim double row of red dots. Bought in Rome.




FIG. 2.—BRITISH MUSEUM.

13. Berlin, 1339. L. 22.5 cm. Neugebauer, *Fuhrer*, p. 32, pl. 11; Maximova, p. 110. n. 1. As last, but red only for mouth and nostrils, no white. Vase-mouth plain and of different form. From Vulci.

14. Louvre, 17. From Italy. Must have been over 40 cm. in length (Payne, *loc. cit.*).

These vases lack the dashes, but 11 and 12 are associated with our group by the dots, the colouring of the ears (*cf.* especially the boar's head 4) and the form and decoration of the vase-mouths, on which see also group E. 13 lacks many of these details, but besides the dots it is very close in general form, which differs from the corresponding Corinthian type, particularly in the treatment of belly and hind legs. The same is true of the splendid fragment 14, of which the fore-part is missing.

15-16 are known to me only from Maximova's⁶ mention and Payne's,⁷ but they probably belong to the same group.

15. Villa Giulia. From the Agro Falisco.

16. Vienna, 132. Hind legs drawn up.

The delightful crouching hare, Lausanne, 4017, Maximova, pl. XXII, 87, might also belong to our series.

E. Eagle's heads, cut off flat at the neck with aryballos-mouth set in centre of flat area.

17. Vatican. Albizzati, 113, pl. 9; Maximova, pl. XXIII, 90, and pp. 118, 175. L. 12.1 cm. Head reserved; black: ring at neck, border of flat area, eyes, nostrils, fringe of dots round mouth; incised maeander with white and red details on neck ring, incised cable on border of flat area. Vase-mouth black with incised star, and on rim white crenelation with red dots. From Etruria.

18. Vatican. Albizzati, 114, pl. 9. L. 11.7 cm. As last; differences: fringe of black dots to neck-ring, eye reserved with red circle, white crenelation with red dots on neck-ring; on top of head black rosette with white details, just as on bases of 1 and 9, without central blob but fringed with dots. From Etruria.

19. Louvre, 39.⁸ Much restored: vase mouth missing. As 17; differences: no trace of red or white: on top of head, maeander swastika within a square of fine dots. From Italy.

The example in Berlin,⁹ from Vulci, is of a different type, but it has some resemblance to the boar and most probably belongs to our series. In form these vases make a further link between group A and the rest of the series.

Albizzati pointed out that the form and decoration of the vase-mouths of 7, 11, 17, and 18 were similar; we can add those of 5, 10 and 12. The rim-pattern of 5, 7, 17 and 18 is repeated on the neck-ring of the last, along the boar's crest in 4 (Fig. 3) and on the edge of the pubes in 10 (Fig. 2), and elaborated on the neck-ring of 17; that of 11 is repeated in reversed colours on the intermediate circle of the rosette on 4 (Pl. V, 5). The central member of this rosette is repeated with slight elaborations on 1, 9 and 18. That these vases form a coherent series, produced in one workshop if not by one hand, seems to me certain. Where and when they were produced it is much more difficult to say.

1 is from Italy, 'probably the Northern part,' 3 from Chiusi, 6 from S. Maria di Capua, 11 from Cervetri, 13 from Vulci, 14 from the Agro Falisco, 15 from Italy, 17 and 18 from Etruria, 19 from Italy; 7 is probably from Etruria, 12 bought in Rome, and 2, 4 and 5 are from collections largely formed in Italy. Most of them have hitherto been classed as Ionian: 1-3, 6a, 7, 11 and 13-19 by Maximova,¹⁰ 4, 5 and 7 by Langlotz,¹¹ and 1, 2, 11 and 13-18 by Payne.¹² Maximova¹³ regarded 5

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 1.

⁷ *Necrocorinthia*, p. 177.

⁸ Maximova, p. 118.

⁹ 1303, *op. cit.* pl. XXIII, no. 91, and p. 119. L. 6.5 cms.

¹⁰ *Locc. citt.* 6a and 7 are placed in the 'Rhodian group': the rest in the 'Gorgon group.'

¹¹ *Griechischer Vasen in Würzburg*, pp. 20-21, nos. 148, 150, where he associates these three vases, and with them a bull's head, 149, which seems to me of other style.

¹² *Necrocorinthia*, pp. 175, n. 1, 177-9.

¹³ *Vasi Antichi Dipinti del Vaticano*, fasc. 1, pp. 33, 39 ff., nos. 109-23.

and 6 as Italian imitations of Ionian. True, Albizzati,¹⁴ who recognised the connexion of 7, 11, 17 and 18, assigned them to Corinth, but with them all his plastic vases, including certainly Ionian and Italian pieces;¹⁵ Fairbanks¹⁶ likewise listed his whole stock under 'Orientalising Vases of the Greek Mainland,' while Walters¹⁷ finds room for the London duck under the heading 'Athenian Vases with Designs on a White Ground,' but all serious efforts to place them have called them Ionian or Italian imitations of Ionian. The fabric proves that they were not made at Corinth, probably not in Attica, but little else.¹⁸ The proveniences suggest though they do not prove an Italian origin. There are a great number of Italian plastic vases, consistently shabby in fabric and poor in style; if our admirable series was made in Italy, it must have been by Greeks, and it should be possible to determine more closely the Greek connexions of the style. As we have seen, these are generally sought in Ionia, but in many points the style of our vases differs from that of demonstrably Ionian types, and associates them with the other main tradition of plastic vases, the Creto-Corinthian. Payne¹⁹ pointed out that the practice of covering large areas of plastic vases with dots is found in Crete from an early period and borrowed by Protocorinthian, which transmitted it to Corinthian, whence it was imitated in Italy. He added that it was virtually unknown in Ionia, and of the exceptions he cited all but two²⁰ belong to our group. It is true that a simple technical practise like this could be imitated anywhere at any moment, but it is, I think, only the most obvious sign of a deeper difference. Perhaps the most typical Ionian plastic vases with varnish paint decoration are those in the form of female heads, and these always have the same scheme of colour: hair and dress painted, face reserved with eyes, eyebrows, etc., picked out in paint. This 'naturalistic' system the Ionians extended to animals—lions', horses' and rams' heads all tend to have reserved faces and dark manes. Human heads are rare in the Creto-Corinthian tradition, and this anthropomorphism is totally absent from their animal representations. The painted decoration of the latter seems to be planned to produce a pleasantly varied surface, while giving a general effect of a feathery or furry, a hairy or bristly creature. The artist will even introduce purely decorative motives like rosettes or

¹⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 96, n. 1.

¹⁵ See *Necrocorinthia*, p. 179, bottom.

¹⁶ *Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Greek and Etruscan Vases*, I, 175-9.

¹⁷ *Catalogue of Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum. II, Black-figured Vases*, pp. 47, 283 ff.; p. 295, B 666.

¹⁸ I have only examined 1, 6, 10, 14 and 19, but descriptions of the rest tally. Corinthian clay is generally distinctive, Attic often so, but most others are unreliable. See further below. p. 50, n. 57.

¹⁹ *Necrocorinthia*, p. 175.

²⁰ Hare, Lausanne, 4017. Maximova, pl. XXII, 87, which may belong to our series (see above): monkey, A 1107, *loc. cit.* pl. XXII, 89. The Cycladic griffon-oenochae has dots on the face, as

have a bull's head and horse's head from Gela, of peculiar style—probably local pasuches (*M.I* xvii, pp. 717-18, figs. 548-9).

I know only three other plastic vases which shew the areas of short dashes typical of our series: (1) a fragmentary vase from Ialysos (*Clara Rhodos*, III, p. 35, fig. 19) in the form of a boar, with the orifice in its forehead: from the publication it appears to be covered with dashes, but the drawing is so grotesque that one can tell nothing—it might, I suppose, belong to our series: (2) the beautiful Etruscan lion in the Briush Museum, E 803, early fourth-century B.C.?—very close in style to the Arezzo chimaera: (3) a fine stag of the same fabric in the Louvre, 176.

palmettes²¹—motives which an Ionian confines strictly to helmets or dresses where they make no offence against nature. The majority of our vases go obviously with the Cretan-Corinthian tradition in this point; exceptions are the eagles' heads, but even here we find on the top of the heads rosettes and linear ornaments.

A point on which our vases show divided allegiance is the orifice. Ionian plastic vases almost invariably have an aryballos-mouth;²² Cretan and Protocorinthian invariably conceal it about the person of the vase, while Corinthian for the most part follows this tradition, but shows a good many examples with a vase-mouth, probably imitating Ionian. Our full-figure vases carry a vase-mouth and so do the monkey 'protome' and the eagles' heads; the other four heads conceal the orifice in the ear. This particular ingenuity does not occur in Protocorinthian or Corinthian;²³ I know of seven vases outside our series which have it: three bulls' heads, one Boeotian²⁴ the others probably of Italian provenience,²⁵ and four Cretan owls, two of one type from Afrati,²⁶ one of another from the same site,²⁷ and the double vase from Knossos in Oxford.²⁸

Vases in the form of owls are regular only in Cretan and Protocorinthian, and the latter differ in species and pose from the former.²⁹ Our Boston owl (Fig. 1 c) is of the earless Protocorinthian species, though the great painted volutes in which the eyebrows end could perhaps best be explained as relics of ears,³⁰ but the position is that of the first two Afrati examples mentioned above, and of a third from the same site;³¹ I know no others.

The aidoion vase occurs in Ionia, but is much more typical of Corinth.³² Our example (10, Figs. 2 and 3) is similar in form to the simpler piece from Vetulonia (*Vds.* 1894, 347, Fig. 16, *CVA Firenze*, Fasc. I, III C e, Pl. 3, 7), cited by Maximova and Payne as Corinthian, and another better preserved in the Castellani collection (Mingazzini, 385, Pl. XXX, 6, 7); see further below.

The practice of decorating the cut-off surface of head vases recalls the

²¹ Palmette, Protocorinthian duck in Berlin, 3676, Neugebauer, *Fuhrer*, pl. 11; Maximova, pl. XLIV, 16; Johansen, pl. XLI, 1; Payne, *Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei*, pl. 25, 5; rosettes, Cretan double owl-vase in Oxford (see below); Corinthian fragments of eagle's head from Cortona; Acheloos head, Maximova, pl. XLIII, 162, and others of the same type; cf. the patterns and animals on the fat men, e.g. Würzburg, Langlotz, 145, pl. 19, and *Clara Rhodos*, vi-vii, pp. 87-91, figs. 97-100 and pl. IV.

²² The swallow, Maximova, pl. XVIII, 74, has only a small hole in the top of the head. This charming vase, and such ducks as Maximova, pl. XIX, 75, among Ionian vases, with the Vatican and London ducks in our series, shew the two styles at their nearest approach, but they are very different: the featherless back of the swallow would be unthinkable in our group.

²³ Cf., however, the Corinthian Acheloos heads, which have it in or under the horn.

²⁴ From Orchomenos, *BCH* xix, 171, fig. 5.

²⁵ Berlin, 1340, Gerhard Collection (see above); Louvre from the Campana Collection, *CVA* fasc. 8 (France 12), III, *loc. cit.* pl. 7, 28-30, Maximova, pl. XXXVIII, 42.

²⁶ *Annuario*, x-xii, pp. 321, fig. 418, and 342, fig. 444; *Liverpool Annals*, xii, pl. IV.

²⁷ *Annuario*, x-xii, p. 547, fig. 611.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 548-9, fig. 612 a-b; *CVA* fasc. 2, IIa, pl. III, 1-4.

²⁹ *Necrocorinthia*, p. 175 and n. 2.

³⁰ Cf. the whorled ears on certain Chalcidian eye-cups—the side of the Phineus cup shown *FR* I, p. 219, and others, Pfuhl, fig. 165, Rumpf, pl. CLXXVIII ff.

³¹ *Annuario*, x-xii, p. 223, fig. 251; *Liverpool Annals*, xii, pl. IV.

³² See Maximova, Pl. XXIX, no. 144, and p. 90, Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, p. 176, Beazley in *BSA* xxix, 202. To the Corinthian examples add B.M. 61.4-25.38, from Camirus.

early Protocorinthian lion protome in Syracuse, which bears a gorgoneion.³³ Of the many Ionian vases of this form I know none on which this area is decorated, unless the Berlin eagle's head from Italy, mentioned above as perhaps belonging to our group, be really Ionian.³⁴ The forms, however, which the decoration of this surface takes on our vases are Ionian in origin. The favourite rosette in its simplest form (see above p. 44) is regular on wild-goat style vases in their later phases, though it also occurs on a small scale on Corinthian plastic vases, *e.g.* the fat man from Rhodes (p. 46, n. 21, above) and a fragment of uncertain shape from Naucratis in the British Museum. In the latter case it has a fringe of dots, as on our eagle's head no. 18. The maeander swastika, a common East Greek filling ornament, appears as an isolated motive on the necks of Caeretan Hydriae (cf. Giglioli, *L'Arte Etrusca*, Pls. 128-9). The horse's head (pl. V, 3) from



FIG. 3.—WÜRZBURG 150.

the base of the Berlin antelope's head (Fig. 1 *a*), seems to be related to the horses on a plate from Rhodes in Berlin³⁵ and a dish-fragment from Naucratis in the British Museum,³⁶ both of which show a similar primitive rendering of the bit, though on neither is it of the same type. The relation, however, is not close.³⁷

On examination of details, then, our vases show connexions both with the Ionian and the Creto-Corinthian traditions; in general style they seem to me to stand far closer to the latter. This is compatible with several origins: they might be made in Crete under mild Ionian influence,

³³ Maximova, pl. XLIV, 166; Johansen, pl. XLI, 5; Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, pp. 80, fig. 23, 171, fig. 71.

³⁴ Cf. the lion's head from Italy in the Louvre 38, Maximova, pl. XLIII, 163, there classed as Italo-Corinthian. L. 8.5 cm. The rosettes on the face

(cf. p. 46, n. 21) are identical with those on our no. 10 (fig. 3) and I think it very probable that this vase also belongs to our series: the clay is suitable.

³⁵ 3724, Neugebauer, *Fuhrer*, pl. 17.

³⁶ 86. 4-1. 1272, *JHS* xlv, pl. VII, 9.

³⁷ See below.

or in Ionia under strong Corinthian influence, or under mixed influence in some third place—Boeotia, the Cyclades, the West. The proveniences strongly favour the West, particularly Etruria. Of the five exact proveniences one is in Campania, the other four are in Etruria; two more are certainly from Etruria and a third probably; three others from Italy; none recorded from elsewhere. It has been suggested³⁸—and I personally think the suggestion sound—that in the second half of the sixth century there were a number of Greek workshops established in Etruria, probably at Caere, which produced the class of vases known as Chalcidian, and the Caeretan hydriae. Langlotz³⁹ has already associated the Würzburg duck (5) with Caeretan hydriae, dating it to *c.* 530. The lack of Corinthian influence in the Caeretan hydriae seems against a very close association with our group, but I think it likely that the latter were in fact produced by a Greek settled in Etruria, under similar conditions and probably about the same time as the Chalcidian vases. The distribution of Chalcidian vases is like that of ours, though wider, and the relation of the Chalcidian style to those of Corinth and Ionia is almost exactly that which we have observed in our pieces. Once regarded as pure Ionian, this class has been shown by Rumpf⁴⁰ to be far more intimately allied with Corinthian, though Ionian influence, particularly on the later vases, remains an undeniable fact.⁴¹ Chalcidian vases began to be made about the middle of the sixth century, the time that Corinth was ceasing to produce vases with figure decoration. It is likely that the Chalcidian industry arose to fill the gap so left.⁴² The dating of Corinthian plastic vases is less sure, but many types can be fixed in the first quarter of the sixth century,⁴³ and there is little reason to believe that many examples belong after the middle. Our group may well have begun, like the Chalcidian series, as an effort to supplement the failing Corinthian supply. Such a supplement would have been especially desirable, as plastic vases, and indeed aryballoi in general, are rarely found in Attic pottery of this period.⁴⁴ On this assumption hares like the Berlin example (13)—standing closest to the Corinthian tradition and with least of the typical traits of our series—would be among the earliest,⁴⁵ while later the artist develops his own style with borrowings from Ionia. His only effort at life-drawing, the horse's head (pl. V, 3), suggests dim memories of an Ionian upbringing,⁴⁶

³⁸ See especially H. R. W. Smith, *The Origin of Chalcidian Ware*, pp. 101 ff., 112 ff., 133, n. 119, and *passim*. Prof. Smith has not absolutely proved Etruria the home of Chalcidian vases, but he has shifted the burden of proof on to those who believe otherwise, and established a strong probability that his hypothesis is actually correct.

³⁹ P. 21, no. 148.

⁴⁰ *Chalkidische Vasen*, pp. 145 ff.

⁴¹ Smith, *loc. cit.* pp. 112, 125 ff.

⁴² Smith, 112.

⁴³ Payne, *Necrocorinthus*, pp. 176–80.

⁴⁴ Cf. Beazley, *BSA* xxix, 200–4. This explains the lack on our vases of the Attic influence so prominent in Chalcidian. The rendering of the boar's tusk from the upper jaw (pl. V, 4) is best

paralleled on two Attic pieces of the mid-sixth century—the Calydonian boars on the François vase and on a beautiful fragment from the Acropolis of Athens attributed by Rumpf to Sakonides (*Graef.* 782, pl. 50; Rumpf, *Sakonides*, 71 and p. 12). In nature the boar has a small upward-curling tusk from the upper jaw; this is almost always omitted in early Greek art. It might be suggested that our vases are themselves Attic, but the clay would hardly pass, and the total lack of finds from Athens, Attica, Boeotia, etc., put it nearly out of the question.

⁴⁵ Perhaps also the lion's head in the Louvre (above, p. 47, n. 34).

⁴⁶ See above, p. 47.

but though the drawing is amateur and crude, the system of forms—jaw, nose, mouth—is far more advanced than in the Ionian parallels cited above. The latter probably belong to the first quarter of the century, but our piece can be very much later. It can perhaps fairly be compared to the human heads doodled inside the mouth of a Fikellura amphora and under the foot of a Caeretan hydria.⁴⁷

An indication of a date not earlier than the middle of the century is given by the shape of the pubic hair on no. 10 (Fig. 3), and on the Corinthian vases from Vetulonia and in the Castellani Collection.⁴⁸ Other Corinthian examples have a straight upper edge, and the same form is found on early sculptures, *e.g.* the Delphi twins and a splendid fragment from Delos,⁴⁹ which cannot be much after 600 B.C. The form with two arcs rising to a central point is certainly later; the earliest examples that I can find are on two bronze statuettes of about the middle of the sixth century, a warrior in Athens and one from Olympia in Berlin.⁵⁰ In both cases the arcs are shallower and the central point is lower than on our vase, but much the same as on the two Corinthian pieces. The Attic vase signed by Priapos,⁵¹ which belongs early in the third quarter of the century, retains the old form, and the later Attic vase in Boston⁵² is only more elegant, not essentially different. Attic red-figure, however, of the time of Euphronios and the succeeding generation offers examples of the three-peaked form at an exaggerated stage of refinement.⁵³ A fair parallel to ours is found on a very early red-figure oenochoe in Goluchow, about 530 B.C.⁵⁴

The evidence, then, as to the date and place of manufacture of our vases is scanty and non-committal, but it does seem to suggest that they were made about the same period as the Chalcidian series, under similar influences and at a centre commanding in a small way a similar distribution. One cannot, I am afraid, safely go further, and attribute them to a Chalcidian workshop. Caeretan hydriae were very likely produced at the same place and during part of the same period as Chalcidian,⁵⁵ but they remain distinct fabrics, and our group may well have come from a workshop independent of either. Corinthian plastic vases are associated with the painted vases of that fabric by their clay, by the occurrence in both classes of plastic heads of identical style, and by combined pieces like the Louvre comast;⁵⁶ Ionian groups are established

⁴⁷ *Delos*, XVII. pl. LI. 7b; Louvre, E 696; Pottier, II. pl. 52. *Cf.* also the very crude outline heads on Corinthian ring-vases and the Corinthian practice of drawing outline heads on arxiballo handles.

⁴⁸ See above, p. 46. The Corinthian examples are less advanced in form than ours.

⁴⁹ Déonna, 201, fig. 94. Here the corners are cut almost square, and the ensemble is strikingly like such a vase as Maximova, pl. XXIX, 144.

⁵⁰ Zervos, *L'Art en Grèce*, fig. 203; Neugebauer, *Katalog*, 161, pl. 21.

⁵¹ Hoppin *Black-figure*, 316; Beazley, *BSA* xxix, 202 f.

⁵² *AJA* 1918, 270, fig. 11; Beazley, *loc. cit.* p. 203.

⁵³ *Cf.* Pfuhl, figs. 316–18 ('Euphronios', 372; early Kleophrades Painter), 389 ('Eucharides Painter').

⁵⁴ Beazley, *Vases in Poland*, 11–13, pl. 3, 1. The arcs here coincide with, if they are not determined by, the lower contour of the belly-muscles, which are stylized as a series of circles.

⁵⁵ Smith, 133, n. 119, with references. Some Pontic vases may also have been made there (Smith, *loc. cit.* Ducati, *Pontische Vases*, 22 f.).

⁵⁶ Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, 175 f., pls. 44, 5 and 48, 13–14.

as such in the first instance by proveniences, and it is not possible at present to associate them with particular series of painted vases. In our case the clay is non-committal though suggestive; ⁵⁷ the proveniences and the relations to other styles can do no more than afford a possibility that these vases are actual products of a Chalcidian firm.⁵⁸ If Chalcidian vases are ever proved to have been in fact made, as remains possible, at Chalkis, it will not follow that our series was made there too. On the other hand, the existence of a class of plastic vases of this style and with this distribution seems to me to go a little way towards confirming the hypothesis that Chalcidian and Caeretan vases were made in Etruria.

In any case, the series is worth attention on its merits. There is no evidence in it of the mass production and decadence that overtook the Corinthian series, and the finest pieces—the boar's and eagles' heads and the ducks in Würzburg and the Vatican—are unsurpassed in their kind in the sixth century, and in the seventh only by the best Protocorinthian.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

British Museum.

⁵⁷ See above, p. 45, n. 18. It is a brownish clay with a reddish or golden tinge, of the same general character as Chalcidian and Caeretan. The shiny surface and glossy, but sometimes perishable varnish are also paralleled in both wares.

⁵⁸ One can find certain resemblances, but nothing in the least conclusive: the Chalcidian use of the step-pattern—an old-fashioned pattern far more boldly exploited than in other wares of the period—produces an effect, and implies an approach, similar to that of the dot and dash style; crenelation is a favourite pattern in Chalcidian for dress-borders, helmet-crests, etc.; Chalcidian eagles often have long heads (Rumpf, pls. VII, XIV, XXII)—a peculiarity arrived at in our vases by the demarcation of a separate area between the brow and the beak;

the high-piled eyebrows of the boar give it a real likeness to the noble cattle of the Garyvones amphora (Rumpf, pl. VIII). Perhaps also worth noting are the speckling of the boar's skin on the Munich hydria (Rumpf, pl. XXIII), and of the ear on a fragmentary eye-cup in the Villa Giulia (Rumpf, pl. CXCI); also the fringe of strokes round the panther's mask drawn in outline on the Phineus cup (Rumpf, pl. XLIII, seen better *FR* I 216). The round heads of the ducks with their incised eyes are not unlike those of the Philadelphia stand (Smith, 89, fig. B, pls. 9, 10). The eyebrows of the owl with their spiral ends have already been compared with those on Chalcidian eye-cups (above p. 46, n. 30).

ZEUS IN THE *PROMETHEIA*

THE controversy about Zeus in the *Prometheus Vincitus* started by the late Dr. L. R. Farnell (*JHS* liii, 40 ff.) is not settled. Answers are wanted to three sharp-sighted questions asked by Dr. R. H. Malden (*ibid.* liv, 201). The first is whether any one has considered the relation of the *Prometheus Vincitus* to the Semitic (Babylonian) myth of the fall of man. Later Dr. Malden writes: 'In Genesis the myth is used as the vehicle of a mediation on the origin and nature of sin. . . . But what was the original form [of the myth] before it had undergone the moralising process? . . . It is not impossible that . . . the moral character of God was not beyond criticism . . . the idea of a deity hostile to mankind presented no difficulty to the Semitic mind.' Thirdly, he questions the assumption made, in his answer to Dr. Farnell, by Mr. H. D. F. Kitto (*ibid.* liv, 14 ff.), that the High God must be all-powerful and immortal.

Lately M. Dmitri Merezhkovsky has compared the myth of Prometheus with Babylonian myths (*The Secret of the West*, translated by J. Cournos, London, 1933, 57 ff., citing *Bab. Tab. B.M.* VI. 5, *Beros. Babyl. ap. Damascen. de prim. princ.* 125, *Cuneiform Texts*, I. c). Similar comparisons had been made before, for example by the late Professor A. H. Sayce in 1884 (*The Ancient Empires of the East*, 157. Cf. my forthcoming remarks in *TAPA*, lxvii; and now E. O. Forrer, *Mélanges Cumont*, 686 ff.) In the Babylonian myths a god must be slain to create man. Bel mixes divine blood with clay for this purpose, and hence man has intelligence. The parallel with Aeschylus and Horace is very close, though transferences of agency are obvious. Since a god is sacrificed, Christ and Siva are not the only parallels to Prometheus, as Dr. Farnell thought (*JHS* liii, 40; cf. Walter Headlam, *CQ* xxviii, 63).

This cosmological necessity to sacrifice a god does not imply that the supreme god was morally imperfect. 'Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.' I am not sure that what has happened to the myth is a moralising process. The myth has rather been developed in various directions for various purposes, all more or less moral. It might even be said that the Babylonian myth is nearer to the New Testament than to Genesis. On the other hand, in Greece as elsewhere, 'the gods have their own laws,' as Professor H. J. Rose has explained (*Modern Methods in Classical Mythology*, *pass.*). What would be immoral for a man need not be immoral for a god. Furthermore, Heraclitus already saw, brilliantly enough, that 'Man lives because the gods die.'

Echoes of the Babylonian myth, by whatever way, had certainly reached Aeschylus. But his treatment of the story of Prometheus was conditioned by other matters also, of a different kind; and here is an explanation why he demoralised Zeus, as he certainly did, and as Dr.

Farnell showed. For the question is not why Zeus is morally imperfect—he is nearly always that, by human standards—, but why he is Satanic, as bad as he can be. No moral imperfections in the Supreme Being farther back in the history of myth are sufficient alone to explain this. Certainly, the idea of a deity hostile to mankind need not have presented difficulty to the Semitic mind. Hostile deities are common: one of them, the Persian Ahriman, seems to have helped to create the later Semitic conception of the Devil. But even then it is harder to find examples of *supreme* deities who are consistently hostile to mankind. Perhaps the Etruscans come nearest in antiquity to such a conception. They may have somehow affected myth, on its way from Babylonia to Aeschylus, possibly while they were still in Asia Minor. The Kratos and Bia of Aeschylus, with their instruments of force, are strangely like the Dantesque divinities in Etruscan paintings of Hell. But whatever the influences were, Aeschylus went further than any other Greek, and perhaps than any one at all except the Albigenians, in satanising deliberately the supreme god. The reason is not mythological, but artistic.

The art of Aeschylus is symbolical, as Dr. F. M. Cornford showed (*Thucydides Mythistoricus*, 137 ff.). The characters are ideal forces, revealed, as they interact in the world, by the light of poetry. Further, in Aeschylus the reconciliation of opposing forces is more important than the nature of the forces. This was proved for the *Eumenides* by Professor C. M. Smertenko (*JHS* lii, 233 ff.), and is true of other plays. Some important progress has now been made by Dr. E. T. Owen (*The University of Toronto Quarterly*, II, 498 ff.). He explains that our usual Aristotelian conception of the tragic does not fit Aeschylus. In the *Oresteia* Aristotle's formula is 'simply dwarfed.' The technique of Aeschylus is functional, intended to affect by ritual the welfare of the community. The chorus, by reiterating a story, 'hope to make it so' in the present case; some of the results may be unforeseen, but the spectator is then made to feel another and greater purpose which will in the end reveal the designed harmony of the whole. The plays describe a triumph—'in its most prosaic form, the triumph of civilisation.' Terrible legends are chosen, not primarily because they are 'tragic,' but because they present most sharply the problem of man's place in the universe. In the *Prometheus* man's mind faces 'the dark and hostile powers' of the universe, and compels them to meet his demand for reason and justice. Here the conception is so plain that it is 'almost allegory.'

Since therefore Prometheus represents mankind and since Zeus is chosen to be his antagonist, it follows that Zeus must be Satanic, with all the implacable hostility that he can sustain. Independently of Dr. Owen, I had reached a conclusion like his (*TAPA* liv, p. liv; *Greece and Rome*, v, 29 ff.). 'Aeschylus, expressing his meaning by his plots and the interaction of symbolic characters, states and solves, with a progressive expansion of his world view, the universal problem of tragic poets, how it is possible that the world order can be ultimately good. The Aeschylean progress begins near the level of common sense, and then advances to a conception of harmony between the gods, rulers, and citizens in a single city state.

In the end he, like other great poets—including Shakespeare and authors of the Bible—finds a solution in a kind of mystical humanism. Abstractions—symbolised, for example, by Apollo, Cassandra, and the Furies—are invalid in isolation: good and evil must be realised in enlightened and evolving human action, directed by the divine and human wisdom which unite in Athena. Thus in the *Oresteia* Aeschylus achieves the marriage of Heaven and Hell, preliminary to a marriage of Heaven and Earth achieved in the *Prometheia*. There Heracles, ideal man sprung from divine evil, masters divine evil itself. Zeus, of course, for the experimental tragic method must be completely Satanic, an ideal and divine tyrant, even though this conception of him has no parallel in Greek thought. Other difficulties, also, in the plays are removed if they are read symbolically: for example, the terms of certain single antagonisms need no longer receive exaggerated emphasis, since they exist to increase the tension of the whole, and to express the universal concept of dualism and disintegration, to be met by poetic synthesis. Aeschylus, partly forestalling the philosophers, declares, by a doctrine of the Sovereignty of man in whole and organic activity, the victory of life over death. He, perhaps alone of classical poets, entirely penetrated beyond despair' (Knight, *TAPA* liv, p. liv).

It is important to regard all the extant plays of Aeschylus, and at least some of the plays that are lost, as a single sequence of developing poetic thought. Accordingly, at the end, when Aeschylus solves the hardest problem of all, the marriage of Heaven and Earth, something like the *Prometheia*, with a satanic Zeus, might almost have been predicted. Everything must be stripped away, as it is from Justice in Plato's *Republic*: and in fact the metaphysical argument may even have some force in determining the date and authenticity of the *Prometheia*. (For convergent arguments cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, lxxvii ff.)

Some account of the mental process, by which Aeschylus came to choose Zeus to represent the hostile forces of the universe, is now needed. The question is psychological, and the required help has been given by Miss Maud Bodkin in a recent book (*Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, 191, 232 ff., quoting especially [239, 242] Lascelles Abercrombie, *The Epic*, 101, and *The Idea of Great Poetry*, 204 ff.). The antagonism between Prometheus and Zeus can partly be traced to a very general psychological tension, between the instinct of self-expression and rebellion against group values, and the opposite instinct to sustain those group values, and to merge personal claims in a greater power. Miss Bodkin shows how Milton's Satan represents both these psychological forces at different times. Sometimes he is the heroic antagonist of tyranny, and sometimes a devilish enemy of group values, conceived to reside in the protection of God. In the mind of the reader there are these forces, sometimes inherited from very ancient times, and they may determine his response to the poetry quite independently of his conscious thinking about God, fate, and morality. As in the mind of poet or percipient the character of Satan alternates, so inversely the character of God must alternate too. In the Prometheus of Aeschylus are remembered dim fears that progress is wrong, inimical to the group; but also there are present instincts of self-assertion and rebellion.

These instincts are connected with the infantile wishes and fears which still lurk in our minds. A poet may 'recall an infantile type of religious fear,' suggesting 'the Freudian doctrine of the father complex or *imago*, in relation to God.' 'The Freudian school of psychologists has asserted that the religious life represents a dramatisation on the cosmic plane of emotions which arose in the child's relation to his parents.' Jung also has enlightening remarks on the Promethean situation (Richard Wilhelm and C. G. Jung, *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, translated by C. F. Baynes, 84 ff.). Prometheus represents consciousness and conscious will, which advance beyond the traditional heritage of 'primordial images' in the mind. 'Consciousness, increased by a necessary one-sidedness, gets so far out of touch with the primordial images as to make a collapse inevitable.' 'The yea and the nay' have not, as usually among the Chinese, 'remained in their original proximity.' 'Consciousness thus torn from its roots and no longer able to appeal to the authority of the primordial images, possesses a Promethean freedom, it is true, but it also partakes of the nature of a godless *hybris*.' This 'higher and wider consciousness which only comes by assimilating the unfamiliar, tends toward autonomy, toward revolution against the old gods, who are nothing other than those powerful, unconscious, primordial images, which, up to this time, have held consciousness in thrall.' I think the religious life is more than that; but such seem to be some of the processes by which patterns of religious myth are formed.

Aeschylus conceived the Zeus of the *Prometheia*, not according to received mythology, but guided by a process of conscious thought, partly controlled by profound unconscious emotional disturbances. In an unconscious part of his mind metaphysical reasoning and poetic intuition took for their symbolic terms systems of association formed of old hopes and fears and convictions, which made myth and poetry both before and after him, in enduring archetypal patterns. His method was direct, self-subsistent, and poetic. This, I think, explains within these narrow limits the Zeus of the *Prometheia*.

*University College,
Exeter.*

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ

A POLYBIAN EXPERIMENT

‘THE story, which ends with the poisoning and suffocation of Demetrius, has reached us in a form which suggests, as do also certain other features of the later life of Philip and of the reign of Perseus, that some author or authors wrote tragedies or historical novels dealing with the ruin of the Macedonian royal house.’ Such is the startling, if cautiously phrased conclusion of a recent historian, discussing the last years of Philip V in a standard work¹; it is a conclusion which deserves careful consideration, for if it can be substantiated, it will be necessary to revise seriously our usual estimate of Polybius’ merits as a historian. And since no discussion of the problem can be fruitful until Polybius’ own attitude towards tragedy and its relations to history has been considered, it is from this aspect that Benecke’s suggestion must be approached.

I

Aristotle² defines the tragic hero as ‘a man who is not eminently good and just, yet whose misfortune is brought about not by vice or depravity, but by some error or frailty. He must be one who is highly renowned and prosperous—a personage like Oedipus, Thyestes or other illustrious men of such families.’ Now, undoubtedly the character in Polybius’ histories most readily answering to such a definition is Philip V of Macedon. Plainly Philip is highly renowned and prosperous; and Polybius repeatedly emphasises his change from ‘the darling of Hellas’ to a cruel and ruthless tyrant,³ showing how ‘his good qualities were, in my opinion, natural to him, but his defects were acquired as he advanced in age.’⁴ And from one passage in particular⁵ it is clear that it was to weakness of character played upon by Demetrius of Pharos, rather than to any innate viciousness, that Philip owed his μεταβολή. Furthermore, in Philip’s career might be traced the requisites for the best kind of tragic plot; the proper effect of tragedy, explains Aristotle,⁶ ‘is best produced when the events come on us by surprise; and the effect is heightened when, at the same time, they follow as cause and effect.’ To Polybius it was a matter beyond doubt that the disasters which clouded Philip’s last years were the just retribution of Tyche for the misdeeds of his youth; and since it is these last years that are in question, it is worth recalling that Aristotle elsewhere⁷ lays down as a dictum that the plot of a tragedy need not

¹ P. V. M. Benecke, *CAH* VIII, 254.

² *Poet.* XIII, 3 (Butcher’s translation).

³ *E.g.* V, 10, 9; VII, 11; 13.

⁴ X, 26.

⁵ V, 102, 1.

⁶ *Poet.* IX, 11-12.

⁷ *Poet.* VIII, 1 *seq.*

necessarily deal with the whole life of the hero, but only with a single set of events forming a unity.

The series of events beginning with the quarrel between Perseus and Demetrius and ending with the death of Philip undoubtedly form such a unity; hence, from the point of view of subject-matter there is nothing inherently unreasonable in Benecke's suggestion.

II

Tragedy in its own sphere is a subject that Polybius never discusses; though his occasional quotations from Euripides⁸ would alone be enough to show that he had an average acquaintance with the tragic stage and its literature. On the other hand, he devotes considerable space to the question of the relation between tragedy and history, and in four places⁹ he goes out of his way to criticise his predecessors, who confounded the two *genres*, and to explain what history was and what it was not. For our present purpose it is plainly very important to define what Polybios means by 'tragedy' in these four contexts.

The first¹⁰ is short and simple; the historian is describing the geography of the Po valley and, in an aside, explains that the Greek myths concerning the river, the fall of Phaethon, the weeping poplars, the black clothing worn by the inhabitants of the district καὶ πᾶσαν δὴ τὴν τραγικὴν καὶ ταύτῃ προσεοικνύαν ὕλην will be ignored for the present, since detailed treatment of such things is not appropriate to the plan of his work; but that later he hopes to find a suitable occasion to make proper mention of them, 'particularly as Timaeus has shewn much ignorance concerning the district.'¹¹

In the second passage¹² Polybius is discussing the historian Phylarchus and criticises him on three scores:

- (a) for his inaccuracy (πολλὰ παρ' ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν εἰκῇ καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν εἴρηκε, 56, 3),
- (b) for his sensational exaggeration (τῆς τερατείας χάριν οὐ μόνον ψεῦδος εἰσήνεγκε τὸ ὅλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ἀπίθανον, 58, 12; τὰς μὲν Μαντινέων ἡμῖν συμφορὰς μετ' αὐξήσεως καὶ διαθέσεως ἐξηγήσατο, 61, 1),
- (c) for his lack of any attention to the causes underlying the events he describes (τὰς πλείστας ἡμῖν ἐξηγεῖται τῶν περιπετειῶν, οὐχ ὑποτιθεῖς αἰτίαν καὶ τρόπον τοῖς γιγνομένοις, 56, 13).

The historian, he claims, is not free καθάπερ οἱ τραγωδιογράφοι (56, 10) to thrill his reader by sensational and exaggerated accounts, or to try to imagine all the probable utterances of his characters and add incidental embroidery of detail to make the subject he is treating more palatable. Of this method

⁸ I, 35, 4 (from the *Antiope*; repeated in a paraphrase VIII, 3, 3; V, 106, 4 (origin uncertain); XII, 26, 5 (from the *Cresphontes*).

⁹ II, 16, 14; II, 56, 1 *seq.*; III, 48, 8; VII, 7, 2.

¹⁰ II, 16, 14.

¹¹ If Polybius did fulfil this promise in Book XII, the passage has not survived.

¹² II, 56-60.

of writing he quotes two examples:¹³ the description of the sack of Mantinea by the Achaeans and Macedonians (56, 6; 57, 1 *seq.*) and the fate of Aristomachus of Argos (59, 1 *seq.*). In these Phylarchus had worked up emotional descriptions, in one case of the hosts of captives with dishevelled hair, clinging to the altars, in the other of the screams that brought out all the neighbours, as the unhappy tyrant was tortured to death upon the rack. In both cases, too, Polybius stresses Phylarchus' failure to put the incidents in proper relation to their causes; but, he says, this is Phylarchus' constant method—ποιεῖ δὲ τοῦτο παρ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν, πειρώμενος ἐν ἑκάστοις αἰεὶ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τιθέναι τὰ δεινά.¹⁴

Our third passage¹⁵ refers to certain unnamed historians, who have used Hannibal's passage of the Alps as a subject for inaccurate and sensational writing; they have exaggerated the difficulties so much that Hannibal appears condemned as incompetent for ever attempting them. And so, finally, they have to introduce gods and heroes to help him out of the situation in which they have placed him. Thus, says Polybius (47, 9), they fall into a position similar to that of the tragic dramatists (εἰς τὸ παραπλήσιον τοῖς τραγωδιογράφοις), all of whom require a *deus ex machina* (προσδεόνται θεοῦ καὶ μηχανῆς), because the data on which they choose to found their plots are false and contrary to reason and probability.

Finally,¹⁶ there is the criticism of certain λογογράφοι, who, in describing the downfall of Hieronymus, have written at great length and, introducing much that is marvellous (πολλὴν τερατείαν), have described the prodigies that preceded his reign and the misfortunes of the Syracusans; these writers, τραγωδοῦντες τὴν ὡμότητα τῶν τρόπων καὶ τὴν ἀσεβείαν τῶν πράξεων, and stressing the strange and terrible (παράλογον καὶ δεινόν) features of his death, have made him appear to be a tyrant far worse than Phalaris or Apollodorus.

These four passages have much in common; directed against former historians, they are all written in the tone of polemic. And from the phraseology it is clear that what Polybius was attacking was a particular form of historical writing, to which he chose to apply the term 'tragic.' Analysis of the examples he quotes shows that the characteristics to which he objected were in all cases those which he specially criticised in that of Phylarchus:

- (1) Inaccuracy: a basis of facts that were unreasonable and self-contradictory.
- (2) Sensationalism: an emotional treatment of the subject-matter, with the introduction of rhetorical speeches and incidental embroidery for effect.
- (3) Neglect of underlying causes.

And of these the last is undoubtedly the worst, since 'in every case the

¹³ The cases of Megalopolis (61, 1 *seq.*) and the figures of the booty taken (62, 1 *seq.*) are rather criticisms of Phylarchus' factual accuracy: and, of course, like the whole of the passage, they are even more criticisms of his anti-Achaean point of

view.

¹⁴ II. 56, 8.

¹⁵ III. 48, 8.

¹⁶ VII. 7, 2.

final criterion of good and evil lies not in what is done, but in the different reasons and different purposes of the doer.' ¹⁷

But in applying the word 'tragedy' to such a form of writing, Polybius is deliberately using it in a loose and vulgar sense; this is borne out by his inaccurate statement, quoted above, that *all* dramatists base their plots on inaccuracies and have to fall back on the *deus ex machina*.¹⁸ This is simply the well-worn device of giving a dog a bad name as a preliminary to hanging him. 'Tragic' is no more than a label selected by Polybius to vilify a school of historians, whose faults were approximately those of our contemporary press. To-day we might prefer the term 'sensational' or 'melodramatic': but Polybius has a right to his own terminology, and it would be making a serious mistake to assume either that Polybius had any objection to tragedy in itself, or that his condemnation of the tragic mode of writing history included anything more than we have seen to be covered by his somewhat peculiar use of the word τραγικός.

III

Against this 'tragic' or 'melodramatic' school, Polybius puts up a moralist's view of history; to him history is a store-house of moral examples, a training for life's vicissitudes.¹⁹ Sensationalism obscures the moral issues, inaccuracy of detail puts the later events in their wrong perspective, neglect of cause and effect ruins the whole moral scheme. Polybius was a firm believer in the power of Fortune (Tyche) to bring a man the destiny he had earned; ²⁰ the historian had only to sift the details carefully and patiently—the bald record of what was said and done ²¹—bring out the nexus of cause and effect and the moral lesson would emerge, clear for all to see.

The process by which Fortune ensures that a man's misdeeds finally (and often when least expected) meet with their retribution is clearly brought out in Polybius' description of the fate of Regulus.²² 'He who had but a short time before refused either pity or mercy to those in misfortune was now almost immediately led captive himself and forced to implore pity for his own life' (35, 3). Furthermore, in his downfall Regulus confirmed the truth of a saying of Euripides, that 'one wise counsel is victor over many hands,' ²³ since the skill of Xanthippus had been sufficient to

¹⁷ II, 56, 16. In general, Polybius' emphasis upon causation is too well known to need stressing; cf. III, 6, and Bury, *Ancient Greek Historians*, p. 200.

¹⁸ It is also borne out by an examination of Polybius' use of the words τραγικός and τραγωδία in other contexts: e.g. V, 26, 9, τραγική είσοδος, that is, Apelles' entry into Corinth with great pomp; V, 48, 9, τραγική καί παρηλαγμένη φαντασία, of a river full of drowning men, with all their baggage, horses, mules and armour; i.e. it is not the *tragic* (in our modern sense), but the *extraordinary* (παρηλαγμένη) nature of the sight that is stressed; VI, 56, 11, ή τοιαυτή τραγωδία used of the pageantry of a religious kind by which the Roman people were

kept in a state of awed obedience.

¹⁹ I, 1, 2.

²⁰ For the distinction between the incalculable, unforeseeable τύχη of Demetrius of Phalerum (cf. Pol. XXIX, 21) and Polybius' own 'pragmatical' conception of a force which worked through error and retribution, in a way profitable for the historian to study, see Laqueur, *Polybios*, 253-4, 276.

²¹ II, 56, 10, τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων καί ρηθέντων κατ' ἀλήθειαν αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν πάνπαν, κἂν πάνυ μέτρια τυγχάνωσιν δοῦτα.

²² I, 35, 1 seq.

²³ Quoted again in paraphrase, VIII, 3, 3.

counterbalance the Roman superiority in arms. From this Polybius then proceeds to draw certain moral conclusions on the use of studying history as an aid to practical life. Now, admittedly it may be sheer chance that a quotation from Euripides is introduced at this particular point. On the other hand, the traditional and best-known examples of moral retribution were those contained in Attic tragedy. When Polybius' thoughts were upon the fate of Regulus, it is natural that he should find images from Euripides occurring to him; whenever a Greek thought of moral weakness, folly, pride, infatuation and retribution, it was inevitably to the figures of tragedy, to Agamemnon, Orestes or Pentheus that he turned for concrete illustration.

Moreover, in his *Persae* Aeschylus had gone further and applied these moral conceptions to an actual historical figure. In so doing he took a dangerous step towards confusing the two forms of writing. Henceforward, there was a distinct risk that a historian with a moral bias might under certain circumstances reverse the process and read such a moral scheme into the life of a real historical personage. Polybius possessed such a moral bias; but for him, generally speaking, this risk would be small. Thus it could hardly occur in his treatment of a Philopoemen or a Flamininus; Polybius knew too much about Achaea and Rome and about the objects and conduct of these individuals personally, to fall into such a trap. But given a figure sufficiently great, of alien race and ambitions, whose actions were on a world scale, whose faults were many and patent and whose end was unhappy, under these conditions such an approach was not impossible; certainly it was not ruled out by anything which Polybius had written about Phylarchus and included under the loosely-applied label τραγικός.

As we have seen, such a figure, corresponding closely to these conditions and excellently suited to moralising,²⁴ exists in Philip V of Macedon and, in particular, the last years of his reign. Our next task will therefore be to consider the tradition for our knowledge of those years.

IV

Our tradition for the last years of Philip goes back partly to Polybius and partly to Livy, following Polybius; how far Livy is accurately reproducing his authority will shortly be considered. In the meantime, three problems suggest themselves :

- (a) How much of the 'tragic' tradition of these years can be attributed to Polybius himself?
- (b) How far is Polybius guilty of the fault for which he condemns Phylarchus? In short, in so far as his version may be termed tragic, has this word the same connotation as it has when applied by Polybius himself to Phylarchus?

²⁴ Cf. Pol. VII, 12, 2 (referring to the μεταβολή in Philip's character) δοκεῖ γάρ μοι τοῖς καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ βουλομένοις τῶν πραγματικῶν ἀνδρῶν περιποιεῖσθαι τὴν

ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας διόρθωσιν ἐναργεστάτον εἶναι τοῦτο παράδειγμα.

- (c) If the tradition goes back to Polybius, what grounds are there for Benecke's suggestion that he used tragedies as his source?

We have already seen that if Benecke's suggestion can be substantiated, it deals a very heavy blow at Polybius' reputation as a conscientious historian; hence the tradition needs careful analysis.

1. Polybius XXIII, 10 (§§ 1-15 Exc. Vales., §§ 15-16 Mai.).

(a) §§ 1-15. 'In this year (183 2) was the first outbreak of the misfortunes which attacked Philip of Macedon. Fortune sent a host of furies etc. to haunt Philip for his past sins and

- (1) These persuaded him to transfer families to Emathia (formerly called Paeonia) from the coast and vice versa, in readiness for his war with Rome. In the consequent scenes of distress men openly cursed Philip.
- (2) Secondly he ordered officers to imprison the children of those he had murdered, quoting a line of verse. Owing to their high birth, the misfortune of these children excited the pity of all.
- (3) The third tragedy which fortune produced was that concerning his sons.

Who can help thinking that it was the wrath of heaven which had descended on his old age? And this will be clearer still from what follows.'

(b) §§ 15-16. 'Philip, after killing many notable men, *killed* their sons too, quoting a line of verse. . . .²⁵ And while his mind was almost maddened by these things (διὰ ταῦτα), the quarrel of his sons burst into flame, as if Tyche were deliberately bringing their misfortunes on the stage at one and the same time.'

2. Livy XL, 3-5. 'The Romans were alarmed at the account brought back by Marcius (envoy to Macedon 183, returned 183 2 winter); plainly Philip was going to rebel and all his words and actions pointed that way. For

- (1) First of all he transported people to Emathia (formerly Paeonia) from the coast, and vice versa, in preparation for his war with Rome. Their curses could be heard throughout Macedon.
- (2) When he heard these curses, Philip became more fierce, and he ordered the imprisonment of the children of those he had killed. This cruelty was rendered more loathsome by reason of the misfortunes of the house of Herodicus.' (Chapter 4 is a digression on the story of Theoxena and her children.) 'The horror of this deed added as it were a new flame to the hatred of the king, so that both he *and his children* were openly cursed.
- (3) These curses, heard by the gods, caused Philip to turn upon his own house. For Perseus . . . ' (Here follows the story of the plot against Demetrius.)

²⁵ There is undoubtedly a gap in the text at this point; otherwise, what follows makes no sense.

See Buttner-Wobst (ed. Polvb.) *ad loc.*

There can be no doubt that Livy is here following Polybius and that, as Nissen first saw,²⁶ we have Polybius in a very abridged form; for instance, the story of Theoxena, reproduced in Livy, is so relevant to its place and so irrelevant to Livy's own subject, that it cannot have come from any source but Polybius. Further, the Polybian excerptor has reduced a narrative in which a series of tragic events are built up to a climax in a sequence of cause and effect, to a tabulated scheme in which this sequence is obscured. To take a single example, the curses which are heard by Philip and so bridge the gap between his first act and his second, and then those which are heard by the gods and so lead over from act two to act three are so dramatically right and part of the narrative, that they cannot possibly be rhetorical overlay from the hands of Livy. Indeed, it is mainly thanks to the accuracy with which Livy has reproduced an original, the form of which appealed to his dramatic sense, that it is possible to reconstruct this original with some degree of accuracy.²⁷

This year witnessed the outbreak of disaster for Philip and for Macedon, an event worthy of attention and careful record.²⁸ Fortune, wishing to punish Philip for all his wicked acts, sent against him a host of furies, torments and avenging spirits of his victims; these tortured him up to the day of his death, never leaving him, so that all realised that, as the proverb goes, "Justice has an eye" and men must not scorn her.' (Next come the details of how these furies work—by inspiring infatuation, which leads their victim to commit acts leading to his own downfall.) 'First these furies inspired Philip to carry out exchanges of population between Thrace and the coast towns, in preparation for his war with Rome; and as a result *men's hatred grew greater than their fear* and they cursed Philip openly. *Eventually, his mind rendered fiercer by these curses, Philip came to feel himself in danger unless he imprisoned the children*²⁹ *of those he had killed.* So he wrote to the officers in the various cities and had this done; he had in mind chiefly the children of Admetus, Pyrrhichus and Samus and the rest he had executed at the same time, but he included all who had been put to death by royal command, quoting the line

ιήπιος ὃς πατέρα κτείνας υἱοὺς καταλείπει.³⁰

²⁶ *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 234. It is the failure to realise the extent to which Livy is here following Polybius that robs Conway's short study of the question ('A Graeco-Roman Tragedy,' *Rylands Bulletin*, 10, 1926, 309–29) of any value. While appreciating the tragic form in which the narrative is cast, the writer attempts to attribute it to Livy and to connect it with the dynastic schemes of Augustus.

²⁷ The sentences in italics have only the authority of Livy; the rest is either Polybius or both.

²⁸ Livy connects the passage with the return of Marcius; this is probably to give it an appearance of importance for Roman affairs which much of it does not possess. The fact was, as in the death of Philopoemen (Livy XXXIX, 49–50), Livy liked the story and was not going to leave it out.

²⁹ Pol. XXIII, 10, 15 (Mai) states that the children

also were killed. But this can be dismissed in view of the agreement between Livy and the Excerptae Valensianae: cf. also Suidas: Φίλιππος τοὺς υἱὰς . . . συμπεριέλαβεν.

³⁰ Was this verse (from Stasinus, cf. Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, ii, 19, 1) actually quoted by Philip, or is it part of the tragic elaboration of the historian? The sentiment was a common one and is to be found, for example, in Herodotus (I, 155) and, significantly, in Euripides, *Andromache*, 519–21: καὶ γὰρ ἀνοία | μεγάλη λείπειν ἐχθροὺς ἐχθρῶν, | ἔξον κτείνειν | καὶ φόβον οἴκων ἀνελέσθαι. We have seen above, § III, how a quotation from Euripides crept into the account of Regulus' downfall. If the present quotation is to be placed in a similar category, its appearance in hexameter form may be not unconnected with the less 'quotable' form of Euripides' choral metre.

The general effect of this was to awaken pity for the children of men of high station; *but a particular incident brought the corresponding loathing for Philip to a climax. This was the death of Theoxena and her sister's children.*' (Here occurred the account of this, as given in Livy.) '*This incident added new flame to the hatred of his people, and they now openly cursed Philip and his sons; and these curses, heard by all the gods, caused Philip to turn his anger against his own blood.* For while his mind was almost maddened on this account (διὰ ταῦτα),³¹ the quarrel of his sons burst into flame simultaneously, Fortune as if of set purpose bringing their misfortunes on the stage at one and the same time. The quarrel was referred to Philip and he had to decide which of his two sons he should murder and which he should fear as his own possible murderer for the rest of his life. Who can help thinking that the wrath of heaven was descending on him for his past sins? The details that follow will make this clearer.' (Then come the details of the quarrel between Demetrius and Perseus: Livy XL, 5-24; Pol. XXIII, 10, 17; 11.)

V

Such, in essentials, must have been Polybius' introduction to the account of Philip's last years. The question arises: how far can Polybius' own criticism of Phylarchus be applied to it? First and foremost, to what extent does it neglect the nexus of cause and effect? A close examination of the passage, from a purely rational point of view, does in fact reveal a clearly defined sequence of cause and effect operating (with one apparent exception) throughout. Philip made the great error (in Polybius' eyes) of planning war on Rome, and to secure the safety of Macedon he carried out exchanges of populations; unfortunately this had the effect of arousing a great deal of popular antagonism, so that Philip, becoming alarmed, was driven to adopt severe measures against certain individuals (the children of men he had already executed) who might prove a focus for disaffection. However, his decree, couched in general terms, embraced more people than was really necessary, thus increasing the popular outcry; the sensational case of Theoxena was seized upon as perhaps the most outrageous injustice and Philip and all his family were openly cursed throughout the land. It so happened that at the very moment that this outcry was at its height the quarrel between Perseus and Demetrius burst out and, naturally, in Macedon men saw in it the answer to the curses.

The main difficulty is to see any real connexion between Philip's actions and the quarrel between Perseus and Demetrius; for plainly the answer to a curse is not a satisfactory rational explanation. And if Polybius proves on examination to have accepted this explanation alone, he stands condemned of abandoning a rational criterion. Apart from the curses, it is Fortune or Tyche who forms the connecting link: Tyche, ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες, brings the two sets of events on to the stage at the same time. Now it was Tyche who first launched Philip on his path of infatuation, and her method

But whether Polybius had, in fact, epic or tragedy in his mind is of course not important: what matters is that the moral emphasis was leading him away

from a purely 'historical' approach.

³¹ Pol. XXIII, 10, 16; almost certainly referring to the curses.

was to inveigle him into a war on Rome; from this step all else followed. But Polybius was interested in the moral lesson, and if Philip's infatuation was due to Tyche alone, how could he be accounted responsible for the results of his actions? The answer was that from the year 183 onwards Philip was indeed infatuated, caught in a chain of destruction and no longer master of his own actions. But the reason for this fate is to be sought earlier, in his impiety at Thermum,³² his brutality at Messene,³³ his treachery at Rhodes,³⁴ his cruelty at Cius,³⁵ his sacrilege at Pergamum,³⁶ and, perhaps above all, in the scandalous compact made in 203/2 with Antiochus against the infant Ptolemy Epiphanes.³⁷ This last outrage, Polybius had already explained, was avenged by Tyche doubly, immediately, in that she raised up the Romans against Philip and Antiochus and forced them both within a short time to pay tribute to her, and then again afterwards, by re-establishing the dynasty of Ptolemy, while those of his enemies sank in ruin.

The revenge of Tyche for the offence against Egypt was to exalt the power of Rome above Philip. Thus clearly Rome was the chosen favourite of Tyche, 'who had guided almost all the affairs of the world in one direction, and had forced them to incline towards one and the same end,' that is, towards the world domination of Rome.³⁸ Hence it is significant that when Tyche is about to accomplish the infatuation and downfall of Philip, her method is to tempt him to plan a war on Rome; and that, just as the wrong done to Epiphanes is righted ultimately in the fate of his oppressors' sons, so Philip's infatuation extends to Perseus, whose hostility to Rome is the main reason for his quarrel with Demetrius, the Roman favourite. Here, then, under all the superstructure of curses and Tyche is the link common to these two sets of events, which are at first sight mere coincidence; it is by a policy of blind hostility to Rome that both Philip and Perseus shew their infatuation and take their place in the tragic sequence presented by Polybius.

On the assumption that Tyche plays an active part in directing the lines of history—and that Polybius believed this cannot, I think, be denied—his analysis becomes understandable.³⁹ To avenge the sins of Philip's youth, Tyche incites him to oppose the power whose rise is inevitable; this policy leads him to a series of actions which bring Macedon to a state of suppressed revolt; then at the proper moment Tyche presses Perseus along the same path in opposition to his brother, so that Philip's life ends amid murder and hatred.

VI

So much is understandable. But Polybius did not leave it at that. Instead he built on these 'basic facts' a superstructure of tragedy, in the Aristotelian sense; the steps leading to Philip's death are embellished

³² Pol. V, 9 *seq.*: XI, 7.

³³ Pol. VII, 11; 13, Plut. *Arat.* 49–51.

³⁴ Pol. XIII, 3.

³⁵ Pol. XV, 22.

³⁶ Pol. XVI, 1.

³⁷ Pol. XV, 20.

³⁸ Pol. I, 4, 1 *seq.*

³⁹ The factual accuracy of this analysis will, on the other hand, be considered below.

with a mass of tragic paraphernalia—furies, torments and avenging spirits of his victims, Justice with her eye, curses answered by the gods. How far do these render him vulnerable to the second criticism against Phylarchus: the use of sensationalism, the introduction of embroidered detail and an emotional treatment of the subject?

The last charge is easily rebuffed; Polybius makes no attempt to involve the reader emotionally in the development of the situation, as, for instance, Phylarchus did in his description of the capture of Mantinea. Nor are the curses and furies, the supernatural machinery, sensational in the way that Phylarchus was sensational; they are here, not for an emotional, but for a moral purpose. But even so, how does Polybius intend his readers to regard these supernatural figures? Are we to imagine that Philip was visited by real Furies, that actual gods sitting on Olympus heard and answered the curses against Philip's line? The notion is preposterous; and Polybius himself gives plenty of hints that this machinery is not to be interpreted too literally. His conscious use of theatrical terminology is a cue that the dramatic form of the passage and the rhetorical introduction of supernatural paraphernalia are merely convenient means of emphasising the moral to be drawn. Polybius is casting the account of Philip's last years as a tragedy and, lest any reader should fail to understand what he is about, he introduces such expressions as τῆς τύχης ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες ἀναβιβασούσης ἐπὶ σκηνήν,⁴⁰ or τρίτον δρᾶμα.⁴¹ And finally, in Philip's speech to his sons (partly, at least, a rhetorical composition, notwithstanding Polybius' strictures on such writing elsewhere),⁴² the broadest hint of all is offered in the words δεῖ μὴ μόνον ἀναγινώσκειν τὰς τραγωδίας καὶ τοὺς μύθους καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ γινώσκειν καὶ συνεφιστάνειν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος.

VII

Now, as we saw, the basis of this superstructure, this dramatisation of Philip's last years, the better to bring out the doctrine of sin and retribution, is the assumption that Philip planned an aggressive war on Rome; it was this primary act of folly and infatuation which caused the transfer of populations and the whole sequence which followed it, and it was this alone that formed the rational connexion with the quarrel between Perseus and Demetrius. The third accusation against Phylarchus was that of inaccuracy in his basic facts; and it is the accuracy of this theory of Philip's war-policy that must next be considered. The first suggestion in our

⁴⁰ Pol. XXIII, 10, 16. This phrase occurs in two other places in Polybius, once exactly the same as here (XXIX, 19, 2, on the folly of the Rhodians), and once with the substitution of τὴν ἐξώστρον for σκηνήν (XI, 5, 8, on the folly of the Aetolians); in both places it comes somewhat oddly, and without the kind of context which here gives it particular significance. Polybius was always ready to repeat a phrase that took his fancy, thus τῆς τύχης ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες is also to be found at I, 86, 7, and II, 4, 3.

⁴¹ Pol. XXIII, 10, 12. Admittedly, this expression may belong to the excerptor rather than to Polybius himself; but if so, it merely shows that he had appreciated the tone of Polybius' writing in this passage.

⁴² Pol. XII, 25b, 4. Polybius may, of course, have some information on which the speech is founded; there is no justification for condemning it as pure invention as is done by C. F. Edson, 'Perseus and Demetrius,' *Harvard Studies*, xlv, 1935, 196.

sources that Philip was planning a fresh war on Rome comes in Livy,⁴³ in connexion with the schemes of consolidation carried out by Philip between 188 and 185; *cum Perseo rege et Macedonibus bellum quod imminabat non unde plerique, nec ab ipso Perseo causas cepit: inchoata initia a Philippo sunt; et is ipse, si diutius vixisset, id bellum gessisset*.⁴⁴ From this time on the Macedonian war-plans are a constant theme in Livy. Thus, in discussing the consolidation of 188-185, after admitting that the annexation of the Thracian towns of Aenus and Maronea had soothed Philip's anger against the Romans, he adds:⁴⁵ *nunquam tamen remisit animum a colligendis in pace viribus, quibus, quandoque data fortuna esset, ad bellum uteretur*.

There is, however, in Polybius, the report of a conversation which puts these statements in a fresh light. In 184 Appius Claudius was sent out to Macedon to investigate the massacre at Maronea; after he had censured Philip and returned to Rome, the king confidentially informed his friends Apelles and Philocles⁴⁶ that war with Rome was in his opinion now inevitable, but that he was not yet prepared for it. Sooner or later, Rome was going to force a war upon him; in the meantime, he would avoid the clash, consolidate his possessions and manoeuvre for position.

What was Polybius' authority for this private conversation? Both Apelles and Philocles may be ruled out. In 179 they were denounced by Philip as being party to Perseus' plot against Demetrius: Philocles was arrested and put to death, Apelles took refuge in Italy, probably in Rome, but was later recalled by Perseus and, rumour claimed, assassinated.⁴⁷ It is, however, clear from his vivid and detailed description of the Macedonian army review⁴⁸ and the subsequent brawl at Perseus' house,⁴⁹ that Polybius had some Macedonian informant for his account of the last years of Philip. As an exile at Rome, from 167 onwards he must have come into contact with most Greeks of any note, who were living in the city. Many of these, to-day unidentifiable, there acted as informants concerning events in which they had taken part: for instance, Nicander of Trichonium, who was exiled to Rome in 170, probably served as an important source for Aetolian affairs.⁵⁰ It is thus probable that Polybius' Macedonian informant was a member of the circle of Apelles and Philocles, who had fled to Rome, and, wiser than Apelles, had stayed there. Be that as it may, the confident account of Philip's conversation with Philocles and Apelles suggests that here too Polybius' authority was this same highly-connected Macedonian; and its contradiction of the general pro-Demetrian thesis⁵¹ that Philip was planning a war of aggression entitles the passage to particular consideration.

⁴³ XXXIX, 23, 5.

⁴⁴ This passage is taken from Pol. XVIII. 18, which is placed too late in Buttner-Wobst, and should in fact precede XVIII. 6; cf. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, IV, 1, 250, n. 24.

⁴⁵ XXXIX, 24, 1.

⁴⁶ Pol. XXII, 14, 7 *seq.* γενόμενος καθ' ἑαυτον καὶ συµμεταδοὺς τῶν φίλων Ἀπελλῇ καὶ Φιλοκλεί περὶ τῶν ἐνεστῶτων.

⁴⁷ Livy (Pol.) XL, 55, 6-8; XLII, 5, 4.

⁴⁸ Livy (Pol.) XL, 6.

JHS—VOL. LVIII.

⁴⁹ Livy (Pol.) XL, 7.

⁵⁰ Woodhouse, *Aetolia*, 258, n. 1.

⁵¹ This pro-Demetrian source is probably to be sought in Achaëa itself, where there were two opposing traditions for the account of Demetrius' death. cf. Livy (Pol.) XLI, 23, 10-11, and 24, 3-5. Here Callicrates, voicing the view of the anti-Persean, pro-Roman faction, gives what is essentially the account already presented by Polybius, while in reply Archon asserts that *nec ob quam causam nec quem ad modum perierit Demetrius scimus*. Polybius

As here expressed, Philip's policy did not rule out a Macedonian offensive, if the situation should develop favourably to this; but fundamentally it was merely the reply to a Roman policy, designed, in Philip's opinion, first to weaken and ultimately to engulf him. And certainly this reply has nothing in common with the insane aggression which figures in the narrative of Polybius and so, of course, of Livy. Polybius, in fact, normally neglects the implications of this reported conversation; he speaks as if the third Macedonian War were something engineered by Philip and passed on, all ready for the waging, to Perseus.⁵² In this view, however, he ignores the fact that this war did not break out until 172, seven years after Philip's death, and then only after a series of fresh incidents and embassies; and that when it did come, the time of it was decided by the Romans who declared it. The line between deliberate aggression and a precautionary offensive is, indeed, not easy to demarcate; Philip's manoeuvres for position and his determination to face the inevitable blow under the most favourable circumstances possible led him to adopt measures that bore very many marks of an aggressive policy. For example, his negotiations with the barbarians on his northern frontiers must have seemed aggressive in Roman eyes.⁵³ Nevertheless, his fundamental position is quite clear from this conversation, which Polybius repeats.⁵⁴ Here, if nowhere else, the truth comes out; the whole policy of Philip's last years, internal and foreign alike, was based on a conviction that Rome was only waiting her time to annihilate him.

Not everyone in Macedon shared this conviction. When Demetrius returned from Rome in spring 183, he received a warm reception from many who had feared that Philip's policy of resistance might precipitate an immediate war.⁵⁵ In the winter of the same year, we read of measures taken against the children of Admetus, Pyrrhichus, Philip's own foster-brother Samos and others put to death at the same time.⁵⁶ Evidently their execution had been the sequel to some kind of conspiracy; and it is not unreasonable to connect this with the faction which favoured Demetrius' policy of collaboration with the senate and had been driven by fear to the desperate scheme of getting rid of Philip. Once before, in his youth, Philip had had to face a similar plot from a party of highly-placed ministers,

has followed the general lines of the anti-Persean version, adding details of incident (but not motive) from his Macedonian source. (I am grateful to Mr. A. H. McDonald of University College, Nottingham, for drawing my attention to this passage in Livy.)

⁵² E.g. Pol. XXII, 18, 10.

⁵³ Cf. A. J. Reinach, *BCH* 1910, 249-330. It is, however, probable that the alarm felt at Rome was no more justified than it had been during the periods preceding the second war with Philip and that with Antiochus.

⁵⁴ There are other occasions on which Polybius gives an accurate report of some speech or incident without himself seeing its full implications; cf. Pol. V, 104, the speech of Agelaus of Naupactus

in 217 Walbank, *Aratos of Sicyon*, 153-4; Pol. XVIII, 1-12, the conference on the Malian Gulf in November 198 (Holleaux, *REG* 1923, 115-71).

⁵⁵ Pol. XXXIII, 7, 2-4; Livy (Pol.) XXXIX, 53. Polybius' distinction between οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες and ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος καὶ Περσεύς is, however, tendenciously over-simplified by the pro-Demetrian tradition.

⁵⁶ Pol. XXIII, 10, 9. Niese (*Gr. und Maked. Staaten*, II, 570, n. 1) appears to identify these men with the five counsellors executed at the instigation of Heracleides of Tarentum (Diod. XXVIII, 2) in or about the year 205; in this case, the delay of twenty years before proceeding against their children would be inexplicable.

who believed his policy to be contrary to the best interests of the state; now as then he had succeeded in crushing the opposition.⁵⁷

These, then, are the ingredients out of which Polybius has built up his tragic version: first, Philip's policy of resistance to the senate, misinterpreted as an anti-Roman offensive; secondly, the reorganisation of the population in preparation for war; thirdly, the ruthless suppression of the pro-Roman faction and the measures taken against their children; and finally, the assassination of Demetrius, the Roman candidate for the throne. All this Polybius read as the insane policy of a man infatuated by Fortune as a penalty for the many crimes of his past life; misunderstanding the real political situation, he laid every emphasis on the personal tragedy and the moral to be drawn.

VIII

Polybius undoubtedly made a mistake; but it was not the mistake that Benecke would attribute to him. The tragic version in Polybius is of his own construction and does not spring from the uncritical use of tragedies or historical novels (if indeed such a thing as a historical novel existed in the Greek literature of Polybius' time). Polybius' strictures on Phylarchus make it at least extremely unlikely that he could have fallen into such a crude error in a matter of source-selection. Moreover, there is in Polybius adequate material to reconstruct the real motives which influenced Philip throughout these years, a thing most improbable had his sources been mainly of a tragic or fictional nature. Polybius' mistake, either his own, or perhaps one prompted by his Macedonian informant, who may have retailed popular gossip and superstition then current in Macedon, was to interpret Philip's last years as a career of infatuation induced by Tyche and showing itself in an unreasoned programme of planned aggression against Rome. The moral lesson, here Polybius' supreme concern, comes from regarding this sequence as the direct outcome of a misled and misspent youth.

These conclusions are important for their bearing on Polybius' reliability as a source. He certainly does not suffer the blow that would have come from a substantiation of Benecke's theory. He is not convicted of stupid incompetence in his choice of sources, of treating a tragedy or a novel as proper material for history. On the other hand, he does appear to have misunderstood Philip's position and policy, when he had in fact the material available to understand it. Furthermore, his excessive emphasis on the moral issues and his unique and unfortunate use of a tragic scheme and tragic terminology—not in the Phylarchean sense, admittedly, yet none the less tragic in a manner opposed to the requirements of scientific history—these factors make Polybius' account of these last years of Philip one of the least satisfying in his whole work. In the realm of pure fact, in his account of the measures Philip took and the order in which he took them, in so far as they can be gleaned from the fragmentary nature of the text and a careful study of Livy, Polybius is in the

⁵⁷ For the conspiracy of Leontius and Apelles *cf.* Pol. V, 25–8.

main to be trusted.⁵⁸ But in anything connected with motivation, his inordinate stress on the moral issue, his misunderstanding of Philip's real position and, finally, his unhappy experiment in the tragic mode make it necessary to treat his picture of Philip's last years with the utmost suspicion.

F. W. WALBANK.

The University, Liverpool.

⁵⁸ An exception to this, however, is the story of the 'revealing' of Perseus' plot against Demetrius by the 'loyal' Antigonus, the torturing of Nychus and the 'proof' that Flaminius' letter was forged.

There seems little doubt that Polybius has here accepted a pro-Roman tradition current in Achaea for the facts as well as the motives; cf. n. 51 above, and Edson, *op. cit.* 200-2.

STUDIES IN ATTIC TREASURE-RECORDS

[PLATES VI, VII]

II. THE HEKATOMPEDON-LISTS OF 403/2 TO 390/89 B.C.

THE appearance of a further instalment of these 'Studies' has been regrettably delayed, owing to several reasons.¹ The present article is planned on different lines from its predecessor (*JHS* li (1931), 139-63), for, instead of offering a comprehensive study of one reconstructed stele, it attempts to review the post-Euclidean Hekatompedon-lists down to 390/89 as a group, and to establish their chronological sequence, in the light of fresh discoveries. It is proposed, also, to deal in subsequent articles with the corresponding lists for the Parthenon and the Opisthodomos in this period, and to continue the study of the later lists both of the Treasures of Athena and of those of the 'Other Gods' into the second half of the fourth century.

The opportunity of working continuously in the Epigraphical Museum for several weeks during the summer of 1931 enabled me to recognise that in many instances two or more fragments of these *Traditiones* which had been published separately could be assigned to one stele, and also to identify a few still unpublished pieces belonging to this series. Many of these discoveries were promptly communicated to Professor Johannes Kirchner, the editor of the *Editio Minor* of the *Attic Corpus*, in time to appear among the *Addenda et Corrigenda* to *IG* ii.-iii. *Pars* ii. *Fasc.* ii. (1931), pp. 797 ff., and also to Professor W. S. Ferguson, whilst his monograph, *The Treasurers of Athena*,² was passing through the Press; but there is a considerable residue of new material, not included in either of these publications, some of which is incorporated in the present article. It cannot, of course, be claimed that these discoveries are of far-reaching importance, except in so far as they contribute towards the establishment of a fuller and more exact record of

¹ That this article appears over the names of the late Allen West and myself is a natural, but inadequate recognition of his share in its production. I first learned of his interest in the *Traditiones* in 1928 when we began to correspond on the subject, and we had long ago planned to publish jointly our views and discoveries in this field. After my own work on the stones in Athens in 1931, and a visit which he paid to me in England in 1932, a first draft of this article was jointly prepared, but our preoccupation with other, and separate, tasks delayed its completion. And now the tragic death of the more active partner, in a motor accident in September 1936, has left me with the difficult task of completing it with the aid of his letters and notes. In a few places I have

modified, or even rejected, his suggestions, but only after most carefully re-examining the evidence, and I of course accept responsibility for its present form; but nothing can make up for the loss of his whole-hearted enthusiasm in the pursuit of the truth, or of his patient criticism. [A. M. W.]

² Professor Ferguson, who generously acknowledges (*op. cit.*, p. 95) the use made of this information, and has most skilfully woven it into the texture of his book, has, unfortunately, not been able everywhere to avoid interpretations, or textual emendations, based on readings which we have subsequently corrected. These, however, are seldom very important, and affect but little the value of his chapters dealing with the post-Euclidean *Traditiones*.

the Treasures dedicated on the Acropolis, which is a necessary prelude to any authoritative discussion of the methods of their administration, and to any broader historical generalisations based on it. As our work progressed, it became increasingly clear that our knowledge of the fourth-century *Traditiones* rested on a less exact documentary basis than almost any group of Attic public inscriptions, in spite of the labours of our predecessors in the field, and that the establishment of more exact texts was a necessary preliminary.

Moreover, now that the American excavations in the Athenian Agora have, rather unexpectedly, brought to light several fresh fragments of these records, the prospects of still further improving the texts are distinctly encouraging, but it seemed preferable to complete this article without waiting for the final publication of all the documentary material from this source.

A discussion of the post-Euclidean *Traditiones* should ideally begin with the vital question of the date at which the joint board of the 'Treasurers of Athena and of the Other Gods' was constituted, not long before the fall of Athens in 404 B.C. This has, however, been recently the subject of so much discussion that to re-examine the whole question here, however desirable in itself, would hardly fall within the scope of this article, seeing to what a large extent the evidence in the controversy is derived from the pre-Euclidean *Traditiones*. Nevertheless, it will be seen that our study yields certain indications which favour 406/5 as the date for the institution of the joint board, rather than 405/4, or 404/3.³

The fact that this board, from the date of its formation down to some year after 390/89, but not later than 386/5, drew up three separate lists, recording respectively the objects ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῷ Ἑκατομπεδῷ, ἐκ τοῦ Ὀπισθοδόμο, and ἐκ τοῦ Παρθενῶνος, is well established, but there now seems good reason to believe that for a short period a fourth annual list was compiled, recording certain items transferred from the Sanctuary of the Goddesses at Eleusis, which were later incorporated in the Hekatompedon-lists. This suggestion, due to West, seems the only possible explanation of the unusual formula found in ii.² 1375, where the Treasurers for 400/399 hand over to the in-coming board of the following year certain objects described apparently as -- Ἐλευσ[ινύθ]εν --, although the exact restoration of the whole phrase is not easy. The question of the date when these Eleusinian items were incorporated in the normal Hekatompedon-list will be considered below, in connexion with the relief carved at the head of ii.² 1374, which belongs to the same year as 1375, and with a fragment which might perhaps be part of another list of this class.⁴

The chronological arrangement of the undated Hekatompedon-lists in

³ In favour of 406/5 are Ferguson (following Lehner and Kirchner), *op. cit.*, pp. 10 ff., and Kolbe (reviewing Ferguson's book in *Gott. Gel. Anz.* 1934, 6, pp. 250 ff.); Dinsmoor, *AJ.A.* 1932, pp. 150 f., after fully reviewing the evidence, decides in favour of 404/3, and later in an article written jointly with Ferguson, *AJ.A.* 1933, pp. 52-7, claims to confirm this

conclusion by dating the much-disputed final list of the Proneos, i.² 235a in 405/4. Kolbe's criticisms, *op. cit.*, pp. 252 f., seem to carry conviction, though his own restoration of the Proneos-list is not completely satisfying.

⁴ In the second part of this article, to appear later.

the period 403/2 to 390/89, which is the main purpose of this article, rests on a combination of the evidence of form and of contents—evidence which it often proves impossible to treat separately. We may start with the question of the writing, and suggest that it is likely that the three lists of any given year (or the four, during the existence of the separate list of τὰ Ἐλευσινόθεν) would be engraved in immediate succession in the same workshop, and very possibly by the same hand, to ensure a certain measure of uniformity. This possibility, which seems to have hitherto received little notice, proves to be confirmed in more than one instance where dated lists of the same year are available for comparison. Thus, in 399/8 the Opisthodomos-list (1378 + 1398) and the Parthenon-list (1377) exhibit a strong similarity, which may be recognised also in 1390, a hitherto



FIG. 1.—*IG* ii.² 1399. OPISTHODOMOS.

IG ii.² 1373. PARTHENON.

Both ascribed to 403/2 on evidence of identity of hand with *IG* ii.² 1370, etc. (cf. Pl. VII).

unplaced Hekatompedon-fragment, that bears no other clear indication of date; especially characteristic is the use in each of a punctuation-mark (:) occupying a letter-space before and after each weight. Almost equally plain is the resemblance between the writing of the three lists of the following year, 1388 + 1408, etc., 1391 and 1392; and in 403/2 the writing of the Hekatompedon-list (1370 + 1371 + 1384, etc.)⁵ seems identical with that of 1373 and 1399, two unplaced fragments belonging respectively to the lists of the Parthenon and the Opisthodomos (Fig. 1), which on the evidence of their contents may well be placed in the same year. At the same time, we must not overlook the possibility that the same engraver was employed in two successive years, if not more, for it seems no less certain that the writing of the Hekatompedon-list 1372 + 1402, of 402/1 B.C., is by the same hand as that of the corresponding list 1386 + 1381, which on the evidence

⁵ This combination is discussed below, pp. 78–83.

of contents must be placed in the following year (Pl. VII, right).⁶ It is clear that this evidence must be used with caution, since resemblances may prove misleading if isolated from the evidence of contents. For instance, the hand of 1375 (400/399) bears a strong resemblance to that of 1401, which, on the evidence of its contents, cannot be put less than six years later.

In addition to the evidence from the writing, another helpful consideration is afforded by the fact that the Hekatompedon received by far the largest share of new dedications, and that from 398/7 onwards at least, its lists grow progressively longer, until in the year 390/89 the inventory (ii.² 1400) requires a stele with ninety-one letters to the line, and not less than 100 lines in length, since the seventy-two which are preserved do not nearly include all the known contents.⁷ In these eight years, in fact, it seems reasonable to assume that an indication, even if not a proof, of the relative dates of unplaced fragments may be found in their length of line.

When we turn to the order in which the items are recorded, our task is more complicated, firstly, because in the earlier lists (before 398/7) there seems to have been little effort made to secure a systematic arrangement, and secondly, owing to the fragmentary nature of the surviving lists. Nevertheless, it is obvious that certain objects, or groups of objects, appear in different relative positions at different dates, but that from 398/7 onwards such rearrangements in the order were made at the beginning of each Panathenaic quadrennium, and retained until the next one began. Even so, there is little trace of any logical system of classification, and no uniform method was evolved for incorporating recent accessions in the body of the list; thus a batch of accessions may continue to be described as ἐπέτεια for many years. No useful purpose would be served by a recital of all the changes which can be traced in the order of the items, but a few examples may be quoted in illustration: in 398/7 (1388 A, ll. 49 ff.) the καρχήσιον of Zeus Polieus is followed by the χρυσίδες of Artemis Brauronia and six other items before we come to the list of the twenty-seven silver hydriai, whereas in 1401 (394/3?)⁸ the hydriai follow immediately after the καρχήσιον, and the χρυσίδες and other objects are moved down, not just below the hydriai, but to a place following a large group of other objects (οἶνοχοῖ, φιάλαι ἀργυρεῖαι from Eleusis and elsewhere, etc.); this order is repeated in 390/89 (1400, ll. 32 ff.). Again, in 398/7, the gold crown described as ἀριστεῖα τῆς θεᾶς, and weighing 272 drs., 3 obols, and the three silver οἶνοχοῖ which follow it, are entered at an early stage in the list (1388 A, ll. 29-31), as the sixth and seventh items, whereas in 1401 and 1400 they appear after the list of hydriai, in reverse order, as the twenty-fifth and twenty-fourth items respectively (counting the twenty-seven hydriai as one item). And again, the second ἀριστεῖον-crown, dedicated in 398/7 and recorded under the rubric τάδε ἐπέτεια παρέδομεν (1388 B,

* Note the punctuation. / : , the gamma with cross-stroke equal in length to the upright, the smallish theta and omikron, level with the top of the line; for

the date, see below, p. 86.

⁷ Cf. *JHS* 1931, p. 151.

⁸ This date will be discussed in the second part.

ll. 64 ff.), is still entered among accumulated ἐπέτεια eight years later (1400, l. 58), instead of being grouped with the first crown of this type. These, and a few other changes in the order, which may in fact be due to some re-arrangements of the actual objects on their shelves, are not likely to have simplified the task of checking the inventory, but they seem to shew that no deliberate change in the main body of a list was made within a Panathenaic *quadrennium*, though the order of the accessions within that period may have been sometimes modified. Consequently, when we find that the evidence from the order of arrangement agrees with that afforded by the increasing length of line, we may claim to have a workable criterion for dating the lists in the period 398 7–390 89. For the more involved question of the dating of lists for the period 403 2–399 8, the evidence will be considered later; and it may be repeated here that there is no fragment of either a Hekatompedon-list or of one from Opisthodomos or Parthenon which can be placed in the *quadrennium* after 390 89, ending with the presumed separation of the two boards in 385 4.

The following table shows the chronological order proposed for the Hekatompedon-stelai, together with those of the other categories to which a certain, or probable, date may be assigned, in the light of the evidence summarised above.⁹ The detailed commentary follows.

Year.	Hekatompedon.	Opisthodomos.	Parthenon.
406 5 (?)	IG ii. ² 1383 (στ. ca. 70 (?))	—	—
405 4 (?)	1382 (στ. 30)	—	—
404 3	—	—	—
403 2	{ 1370 — 1371 — 1384 (ca. 41) 1503	1399 (ca. 52)	1373 (ca. 46)
402 1	1372 — 1402 (στ. 46)		
401 0	1386 — 1381 (στ. 41)		
400 399	1385 (ca. 40)	1374 (στ. 36) [Op. or Par. ?]	1375 [Eleusis]
399 8	1390 (στ. 51)	1378 — 1398 (στ. 37)	1377 (στ. 47)
398 7	{ 1388 — EM6790 (στ. 45) 1408 (στ. 51)	1392 (στ. 45)	1391 (στ. 42 (?))
397 6	{ 1393 — 1406 (στ. 68) 1448 — 1449		1394 (?) (στ. 28)
396 5	1417 (ca. 63 (?))		
395 4	1409 (στ. 74)		1395—Hesp. V. 389, 8 (στ. 35)
394 3	1401 — EM2512 (στ. 76)		
393 2 (?)	1404 (στ. 76)		
392 1 (?)	EM2497 (στ. 79)		
391 0	1389 (στ. 88)		
390 89	1400 (στ. 91)		

The stones bearing the following numbers in IG ii.² are omitted from the above table, as their dating is still doubtful: Hekatompedon, 1403, 1405 (?); Opisthodomos, 1396, 1397; Parthenon, 1376, 1379, 1380. Of the last three items, 1376 and 1379 seem to be earlier than the year 399 8, 1380 possibly later. Finally 1387 is omitted, as being merely an incomplete copy of 1386.

This arrangement of the Hekatompedon-lists leads to the important conclusion that there is no place in the period 403 2–390 89 for the two fragments which are numbered ii.² 1382 and 1383. As the evidence from their contents forbids us to put them after 390 89 we must not hesitate to date them earlier than 403 2. It does not seem possible to arrive at an absolutely certain date for either, but it cannot be doubted that 1383 is

⁹ The order of the Opisthodomos and Parthenon-fragments not included in this table will be discussed elsewhere. In any case, the evidence from length of

line does not concern them, as they received so few additions.

the earlier of the two, on the following grounds. 1382 bears a considerable resemblance to the lists of 403 2 onwards, inasmuch as it contains, with three exceptions in sixteen items, objects which appear regularly in the Hekatompedon-lists of 398/7 onwards, some of which, moreover, are recognisable in the fragmentary lists of the five preceding years. 1383, on the other hand, agrees with 1382 in only one of the items preserved—namely, a dedication of φιάλαι, weighing over 500 drachmae, by Εὐτρέφης Εὐμνήμονος, but presents certain clear points of resemblance to one of the later Hekatompedon-lists of the old régime, i.² 274, dated to 409/8 B.C.,¹⁰ notably in recording a dedication by some cleruchs, which it is tempting to identify with a dedication in the earlier list. Further similarities may be seen when we proceed to suggest certain restorations in 1383, and we shall find that the length of line involved indicates a stele of a width more nearly resembling those of the old régime. It is to be noted, moreover, that part of the left edge of the stele is preserved, indicating that five letters only are lost from before the Υ in l. 11.

L. 1. As suggested above, the first item seems to have been [στέφανος χρυσὸς ὃν οἱ κληρ]ῶχοι οἱ ἐπ[ι - - - ἀνέθεσαν, σταθμὸν τοῦτο ΧΗΗΑ·]

L. 2. A subject for the verb is required, and following Köhler's original proposal we should probably read [ἐκ τοῦ νεώ]το ἀρχαίο ἀπενεγ - -, recognising in the last word a participle, which may have formed part of a rubric relating to the entries which followed. As some of these are silver, perhaps we might read [τάδε ἀργυρᾶ | ἐκ τοῦ νεώ τοῦ]ἀρχαίο ἀπενεγ[χθέντα - -], but cannot claim this as more than a possibility.

L. 3. - - - - - τε ἀργυρῶ δύο στ[αθμὸν - -] is another unrecognised entry, for which Hiller's suggestion [Ἔρω]τε (*Ed. Min., ad loc.*) is not satisfactory, since we know of nothing similar in the *Traditiones* of the fifth or fourth century. It is much more likely that -τε is the end of a dual participle, e.g. [ἔχον]τε; this suggests some such entry as [σφραγιδίῳ δύο χρυσῷ, δακτυλίῳ ἔχον]τε ἀργυρῶ δύο, κ.τ.λ., which receives some confirmation from the entry in l. 4, where we have to restore [δακτύλιος ἀπ]είρων ἀργυρὸς ὃν Ε[- - ἀνέθηκεν, κ.τ.λ.]. Perhaps another ring was recorded in the second half of this line.

L. 4. The traces of the last letter suggest Λ or Μ, and not Ι or any other letter with a vertical stroke, as Köhler's incorrect copy indicates. If the dedicator was a woman, Ἐλ[πινίκη] is the most likely name; for male names beginning with Ἐλ - - there is a wide choice.¹¹

L. 6. - - ωι χρυσίς, κ.τ.λ. Again perhaps the end of a rubric, for - - ωι can hardly be connected with the χρυσίς which follows, and it is to be noted that the following items, as far as can be seen, are with one exception all of gold. As a possible restoration, indicating the position of the golden and silver objects referred to, I would propose [τάδε χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ παρελάβομεν ἐν τῷ νεώ τῷ ἑκατομπεδέ]ωι,¹² χρυσίς, κ.τ.λ. This χρυσίς,

¹⁰ See Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 ff.

¹¹ For such names, see *P.A.* 4662-84. Only one Elpinike (*P.A.* 4677) appears to be known in addition to the sister of Kimon (*P.A.* 4678).

¹² Mention of the Hekatompedon is not unlikely, in

contrast to the items transferred from the ἀρχαίος νεώς in l. 2. Another possibility would be [- - ἀριθμῶι καὶ σταθμῶι], but as the preceding objects are weighed the repetition would be pointless.

dedicated by Paäpis, may perhaps, according to a happy suggestion by West, be identical with the χρυσίς entered as an accession in the Hekatompedon-inventory of 422/21 (i.² 264, l. 65),¹³ in view of the allusion to the ἐκπώματα of Paäpis in the *Phrateres* of Leukon,¹⁴ produced in 421 B.C. If this is correct, the weight here can be restored (from i.² 265) as ΗΔΔΔΠΗΗΗ; or again it might be one of the two other χρυσίδες dedicated in the same year which together weighed 280(+) drs. Note also that after the name Παᾶπις are faint traces of Ε, perhaps a patronymic.¹⁵ This identification seems to justify the suggestion that the φιάλαι of Eutrephe may be the same as the eight silver φιάλαι weighing 800 drs. which are found in the Hekatompedon-lists from 428/7 onwards (i.² 262, l. 46 f.); but the apparent difference in weight to be observed in 1382, where the same entry appears, is an objection, unless we venture to assume that on a more exact re-weighing they were found to exceed slightly the originally recorded total of 800 drs. Five spaces are vacant in 1383 after Π, which might be completed as Π[ΗΗΗΗ] or Π[ΗΗΗΠΗ], giving 802 or 806 drs.

For ll. 8-9 there is nothing to note, but in l. 10 the enigmatic letters Ο . . . ! ΔΙΟ σταθμόν τ[- - -] suggest the restoration [ἀνευ σ](φ)[ραγ]ιδίω, referring to a ring. The first letter is certainly not Φ, but the upright stroke may have been omitted in error, as it is in the Φ of φιάλα in 1382, l. 6, and no other suggestion seems equally convincing; moreover the presence of a ring in the previous line affords some degree of confirmation to the proposal. The Cyzicene staters, of unknown number, cannot be recognised elsewhere, and perhaps disappeared (into circulation rather than into the melting-pot?) at some date soon afterwards.

The text suggested for 1383 would therefore run as follows:

- - - στέφανος χρ -]

[υσὸς ὃν οἱ κληρ]αχοὶ οἱ ἐπ[ι - - - ἀνέθεσαν, σταθμόν τούτο ΧΗΗΠ - - -
 τὰδε ἀργυρᾶ ἀπ -]
 [ὁ τὸ νεῶ τῷ]ἀρχαίῳ ἀπενεγ[χθέντα - - - σφραγιδίῳ
 δύο χρυσῶ δακτυ -]
 [λίῳ ἔχον]τε ἀργυρῶ δύο, σταθμόν τούτοι - - -
 - - - δακτύλ -]
 [ιος ἀπ]είρων ἀργυρῶς, ὃν Ἐλ[- - ἀνέθηκε, σταθμόν τούτο - - -
 - - - - -]
 5 [. . .]ειὸς ἀνέθηκε, σταθμ[ὸν - - - - - τὰδε χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ παρελάβομεν
 ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῷ Ἑκατο -]
 [μπέδ]ωι · χρυσίς ἦν Παᾶπις Ε[- - - ἀνέθηκε, σταθμόν ταύτης ΗΔΔΔΠΗΗΗ(?)
 φιάλαι ἀργυραῖ ὁ -]
 [κτῶ, ἃς Ε]ὐτρέφης Εὐμνήμον[ος ἀνέθηκεν, σταθμόν τούτων ΠΗΗΗ
 . . . - - - - -]
 [δύο, σταθμ]ὸν τούτοι Η· στέ[φανος χρυσὸς, ὃν - - ἀνέθηκεν (?), σταθμόν τούτο
 - - - - -]

¹³ This is a certain restoration, in the light of the list of the following year (i.² 265).

¹⁴ See Hesychius, s.v. Παᾶπις, quoted by Kirchner

in his commentary on this line in *IG* ii.² 1383.

¹⁵ As Π. was an Egyptian, perhaps ἐ[ξ Αἰγύπτου] would be a likely alternative.

[.]ἰ⁹¹ δακτύλιος χρ[υσοῦς - - - σταθμὸν τοῦτο - - - - -]
 δακτύλιος χρυσοῦς (?)
 10 [ἄνευ σ](φ)[ραγ]ιδίον, σταθμὸν τ[ούτο - - - - -]
 - - - - -]
 [. . . . Κ]υζι[κ]ηνῶ χρυ[σ]ίον στατ[ῆρες - - - - -]
 (*vacat*)

Tentative though much of this restoration is, it leaves a clear impression of a much closer similarity to i.² 274 than to 1382 or any other list later than the year 403/2; and it indicates equally clearly that the stele was wide enough to contain at least seventy letters to the line, as may be seen in l. 6, and inferred in l. 7, where we have the guidance of 1382, ll. 18–20, for the length of the dedication by Eutrephe. The similarity to i.² 274 is also to be seen in the fullness of the descriptions, which distinguishes that list from the earlier ones of the series.¹⁶ The points of contrast between 1383 and 1382 will emerge even more clearly when we turn to the contents of the latter.

ii.² 1382 is a narrow stele, only 0.055 m. thick, with thirty letters to the line, and incomplete both above and below, as well as on the right. It is not necessary to reprint the text in full, but one or two suggestions may be offered for its improvement.

L. 1. The item whose weight ends in ΔΔΔ is very likely to be the two golden crowns recorded in i.² 274, l. 172, weighing 80 drs., which there, as here, come immediately before the golden crown on the head of the Nike. We should therefore restore [- - - στεφάνω χρυσῶ 11, σταθμὸν | τοῦτοιν ^Δ]ΔΔΔ· σ[τέφανος χρυσοῦς ὃν ἡ Νίκη ἔχει, κ.τ.λ.¹⁷

Ll. 6, 7. The two silver phialai dedicated to Athene as an ἀκροθίνιον is one of the few items not recognisable in our later lists. For the missing epithet of nine letters ending in -α we might restore [βαρβαρικ]ά.¹⁸

The other two items not recognisable later are the ἔκπωμα ἀργυ[ρὸν πηγάς]ο προτομ[ῆς], weighing 118 drs., in ll. 13–15, and the eight (?) silver phialai dedicated by Eutrephe (ll. 18–20), already discussed in connexion with 1383.

Ll. 22 ff. The gap of seven letters' length that follows the description of the two stone seals might be filled with the word [ἀστιάθ|μω]. The first of the accessions which follow the rubric [τάδε ἐπέτεια πα]ρέδομ[εν] in l. 24 is the subject of an ingenious restoration by West, based on the suggestion that the dedicator was named Προκλ[ῆς] and is identical with the ἀθλοθέτης at the great Panathenaea, Προκλῆς Κηφισιεύς, to whom the payment of a sum of money is recorded in i.² 305, l. 9, in 406/5 B.C.; and that his offering was a golden strigil, to be identified with the στλεγγίς χρυσῇ found in 1400, l. 50 (390/89 B.C.), where moreover the dedicator's name

¹⁶ Cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁷ This is, I think, preferable to West's suggestion (following Lehner, who did not know the exact description of the item, see his *Schatzverzeichnis*, p. 36) that we should restore here ἀργυρίο ἐπιτηκτο, παρακαταθήκη Μελιτάδο Ἐρχιέως] ΔΔΔ which cannot be

traced in any list prior to 1393. l. 29 397 6 B.C.).

¹⁸ As in 1425. l. 91, φιλία χαλ[κο]κράς βαρβαρική. Another possibility would be [Χαλκιδικά, on the analogy of the ποτέρια Χαλκιδικά in i.² 280, l. 86, cf. Aristoph. *Eq.* l. 237, but we do not hear of Chalcidian phialai.

began with one of the letters B, M, Γ or Φ, since the relative following χρυσῇ is written ἥμ. The appropriateness of such a dedication by an ἀθλοθέτης is obvious, and the date implied would be a valuable clue, to which I shall return shortly. To complete the entry on this assumption is not altogether easy: [στλεγγίς χρ|υσῇ - - (9) - -] Προκλ[ῆς - - (9) - - ἀν|έθηκεν, σταθμὸν] $\square\Delta\Delta$ may be regarded as reasonably certain, and I would suggest to fill the gaps στ. χρ. ἐπὶ ξύλο ἥμ Πρ. Κηφισιεὺς ἀνέθηκεν,¹⁹ quoting as a parallel the restoration which is suggested below ²⁰ in 1417, l. 7 [στλεγγίς χρ|υσῇ ἐπὶ ξ[ύλο - -] for a dedication of later date, which is in turn to be identified with the στλεγγίς [χ]ρυσ[ῇ ἐπὶ ξύλο(?) ἥ]ν Ἀσπασία[- - ἀνέθηκεν], in 1409, l. 14.

The problem of assigning dates to these two lists calls for notice, but does not seem to permit of a final solution. 1382, to judge by its great similarity to the lists of 403 2 onwards, and its differences from 1383, is no doubt the later of the two. Moreover, by its use of the formula τάδε ἐπέτεια παρέδομεν to describe accessions, it falls into line with the later lists, and we can scarcely doubt that it belongs to the period after the union of the two boards of Treasurers. It is later than 407/6, for the dedication of the knife with an ivory sheath (ll. 15-18) is dated to the year of Antigenes, Archon in that year, and is not one of the ἐπέτεια. This leaves us with the choice of 406/5, 405/4 or 404/3 only, since we have already in 1370 + 1371 + 1384 the list of 403/2. If we accept the restoration of Procles' name as dedicator in his capacity of Athlothetes, 406/5 is ruled out; and we are left to choose between 405/4 and 404/3, according as we infer that his dedication was made during his year of office or in that following. It is natural to conclude in favour of the former, but this is incapable of proof. Ferguson's statement²¹ that in all probability no lists were engraved or even compiled owing to the crisis in 404/3 would, if well supported, rule out 404/3, but this statement seems to rest on very doubtful assumptions, so we must be content, until further evidence can be found, with the conclusion that 405/4 seems on the whole the most likely of the three possible years.

1383, which as we have seen, must be earlier than 1382, cannot of course be ascribed to any of the closing years of the old régime, in view of the appearance of new formulae (ll. 2 and 6) and of items such as the rings which are not found in the Hekatompodon-lists under it. We can scarcely question the conclusion that it contains an assemblage of articles from other sources besides the treasures of Athena in the Hekatompodon, and must therefore be a list compiled by the united boards under the new régime. If 1382 is correctly placed in 405/4, then 1383 will belong to 406/5, for we have no reason to believe that the creation of the new régime can be pushed back into the Attic year 407/6, a date which would conflict fatally with the evidence afforded by the last of the Proneos-lists under the

¹⁹ The presence of the wooden handle would account for the weight being perhaps unexpectedly large. West had suggested [στ. χρυσῇ μία, ταύτημ] Προκλ[ῆς Ἀθηναῖαι ἀνέθηκεν], but μία is superfluous,

and ταύτην unnecessary.

²⁰ To appear in Part II.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 57, note 1.

old régime.²² The difficulty that arises from the disappearance of most of the items in 1383 from later lists can only be due to a further raid by the authorities in search of precious metal for the mint. This of course may have taken place again in 404/3, but the need was far greater in 405/4, though this consideration affords no proof that 1383 *must* belong to 406/5.

The *traditio* for 403/2, to which we now turn, has the additional interest that it gives us our first glimpse of the temple-treasures in the years immediately after the war. At the head of the list stands the single golden Nike that had escaped the melting-pot, and which had hitherto been recorded with its fellows—and apparently with certain other dedications—in a separate series of lists.²³ We may note also that though the parts of the statue are arranged in five groups, as was the invariable practice in inventorying this Nike, they are not prefaced by the words *πρῶτος ῥυμός*, *δεύτερος ῥυμός*, etc., which are always inserted into the later lists, beginning with 1388 A (398/7 B.C.); in this omission it resembles the two surviving lists from the old régime (i.² 369 and ii.² 1502). It was, apparently, the mistaken assumption that these words should be restored in 1371 that prevented previous scholars from attempting to combine that fragment with 1370, which is the upper portion of the same stele, since the length of line in 1370 was clearly not more than forty-one letters, whilst 1371 seemed to require lines varying in length from forty-five to fifty-one letters. Actually they make a completely satisfying join, of which the photographs (Pl. VI) leave no room for doubt. To 1371 I joined 1384, not without hesitation, since the latter fragment has been considerably damaged, with the result that much of the inscribed face has lost its finely smoothed surface, and that the back of the fragment has been so much rubbed and flaked away that it does not shew the prominent punch-holes which are so striking a feature on the back of the two upper fragments. There is, however, a contact-surface nearly .12 m. long, and when rightly placed, the position of the right-hand edge, as well as the setting of the lines, confirms the evidence from the identity of the lettering. Actually one complete line is missing, and in 1384, l. 1 (= l. 21 of the stele), we have the end of the weight of the last ῥυμός of the component parts of the Nike. I have discussed elsewhere²³ the restoration of the weights of these groups and need not repeat the details here.

The restoration of ll. 3–11 which contain the Treasurers' names is not free from difficulties. There is no doubt that in the year of Euklides there were only three names recorded, in addition to that of the Secretary: Λυσικ - - (ca. 14) - -, Θεογένης Θριάσιος, and Ἀντιφάνης - - (ca. 9). For the Secretary's name we restore [Μισγός]λας, seeing that Attic names in -ολας are extremely rare,²⁴ and, moreover, that the only Athenian known to have borne this name belonged to the deme Kollytae. Born in 390 B.C., he

²² Cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, Chs. i., vi., xi. It might be added that if 1383 belonged to 407/6 we should expect to find among the ἐπιτετα the knife with the ivory sheath dedicated 'by the Boule in the year of Antigenes,' which is not recorded there.

²³ *IG* i.² 390a - - 399; ii.² 1502. I have discussed these lists, and the other evidence for the Nikai, in the

Centenary volume of the Athens Archaeological Society (in the press, April 1938).

²⁴ Τιμόλας, *P.A.* 13792 (only). If the name had ended in -ελας or -ιλας there would presumably have been traces of E or I on the stone before the Λ, but this is not so.

attained notoriety from his association with musicians, as we learn from Aeschines.²⁵ There would be no objection to assuming that his grandfather bore the same name, and if we put the date of his birth some sixty years before that of his grandson, he would have been not far from fifty years of age when acting as Secretary to the Tamiai in 403/2.

For the restoration of ll. 6–7 we propose, rather diffidently, [παραδεξάμενοι παρὰ τῶν ταμιῶν] τῶν προτέρων T.[- (ca. 13) - - καὶ ξυναρχόντων, οἷς Δ]ρομοκλε[ίδης] - (ca. 8) - ἐγραμμάτευσεν, παρέ]δοσαν, κ.τ.λ. The more natural restoration [παραδεξάμενοι παρὰ] τῶν προτέρων τ[αμιῶν τῶν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρῳ ἄρχοντος, οἷς Δ]ρομοκλε[ίδης] κ.τ.λ. would leave us with an embarrassing gap of about eight letters' length before or after παραδεξάμενοι, as well as omitting the name of the first Treasurer. The latter objection would be less weighty if it stood alone, but as it would also involve the insertion of the name of the Archon, it would give us a quite unprecedented formula. Ferguson retains this order of words, and would insert ἄγραφα after παραδεξάμενοι, though a word of six letters seems too short to fill the gap, and assumes boldly that the Treasurers of the previous year compiled no lists at all of the sacred objects in their charge.²⁶ Nor does he add conviction to his case by reading, instead of τῶν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρῳ ἄρχοντος, τῶν ἐν Ἀναρχίᾳ ἄρξαντων] which incidentally contains one letter less than we should expect in the space available, since he does not take into account that there is a letter lost after the T at the end of l. 6. In the circumstances, the new reading proposed seems to offer many advantages.

L. 8. It is impossible to restore the demotic of the Secretary Dromokleides, for none of the other known bearers of this name can be traced as belonging to the Pandionid tribe, which presumably supplied the Secretary to the board for this year.²⁷ Chronologically, he might well have been a grandson of the Archon of this name, who held office in 475/4 B.C. After παρέ]δοσαν we restore the formula as reading [τοῖς ταμίαις - - (ca. 21) - - Τει]θρασίῳ, κ.τ.λ., since the more natural alternative, namely ταμίαις τοῖς ἐπὶ Μίκωνος ἄρχοντος would leave room for only four—or at the very most five—letters for the name in the dative of the Treasurer whose demotic is Τειθράσιος. Names of the required length are not unknown—e.g., Ἰωνί, or if five letters are to be supplied, Θέωνι or Νέωνι are among the possible choices, but if we omit the Archon's name, we obtain a formula more closely resembling that proposed above (l. 6 f.). We thus find that [Τει]θρασίῳ becomes the demotic of the second Treasurer, and that two names with their demotics are missing before that of -κλῆς Αἰξωνεύς; Πύ[ων Παιανιεύς] (if his deme is correctly restored) is the sixth name, leaving about fourteen spaces for the name and demotic of the seventh Treasurer. This completes the list, and the conclusion that there were seven ταμίαι this year may be confirmed by the restoration suggested below for the opening lines of the Hekatompedon-list of the following year, ii.² 1372 + 1402. In accepting the identity of the sixth Treasurer with the well-known στρατηγός, in view

²⁵ Cf. P.A. 10225.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 57, note 1.

²⁷ Cf. Ferguson's table, *op. cit.* p. 9. Kolbe's scepticism as to the existence of the reversed tribal order of Secretaries to this board, *Gott. Gel. Anz.*

1934, pp. 251 f. seems too sweeping: it seems preferable to believe in the system, at any rate after 406/5, but to admit the possibility of exceptions to the rule.

of the extreme rarity of Attic names so formed, we must conclude that the tribal order is not closely maintained, since Paiania, the deme of Rhinon, belongs to Pandionis, whilst Aixone, just before it, belongs to Kekropis. On the other hand, the remains of the names of the Treasurers in the year of Xenainetos (401/0) which appear in the dative in 1372 (+ 1402) seem, as far as we can tell, to follow strictly the tribal order.

Passing over the problems raised by the weights of the various ῥυμοί of the golden Nike,²⁸ there is little for us to add by way of comment on the contents of ll. 21–9, though it is noteworthy that ‘the crown on the head of the Nike held in the hand of the golden statue’ is not found in any other list occupying a position immediately after the golden Nike, but normally appears lower down; whereas the thymiaterion, which follows it here, retains its place next after the Nike. In l. 27, the number of the Persian ‘sigloi’ is eleven, as in later lists; in 1382, however, it is ten only. In ll. 28–9 the entries of the ὑπόσταθμον and the κρατήρ cannot each have been followed by the indication that they were unweighed, as the space available is insufficient, so we read ὑπόστ[[αθμον χρυσὸν καὶ κρατήρ ἐπίτηκτο]ς ὑπ[ά]ργυρο[ς ἀσ|τάθμω], calculating that twenty-eight letters are lost from before the final Σ of [ἐπίτηκτο]ς. Note, moreover, that the text of 1384, given in the *Editio Minor*, shows l. 8 as ending with ὑπόστ[αθμ], but there is certainly no room for more than one letter at most after the *tau*, and more likely there was none. This entry was presumably followed by the single Phocaeen *hekte*, and consequently the solitary Σ surviving from l. 29 falls into place in the word χρυσὸν, in the familiar entry [σφραγίδε δύο λιθίνω χρυ]σ[ὸν ἔχ]οσα τὸν δακτύλιον ἢ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀργυρὸν].

We cannot accurately restore the entries which followed this item, for we cannot be certain, in view of the very fragmentary nature of the lists of the next few years—down to 398/7, in fact—whether some of the few items preserved in ii.² 1402 (belonging to 402/1) may not have been accessions of that year. By their position at the end of the list this seems probable, and it is unfortunate that neither in 1402 nor in 1372, which is from the beginning of the same inventory, is any entry preserved which is to be found in the list of 403/2.

There is, however, yet another fragment which we would confidently ascribe to the stele 1370 + 1371 + 1384, which preserves portions of six lines, and is complete on the left and below, thus forming the lower left-hand corner of the stele. This is published in an incomplete form in ii.² 1503 as follows:

. . . | -
 . . ἐλ]άβομε[ν -
 . . \ΕΝ ἱερο -
 . . ακα ἀργ[υρ -
 5 . τ]ῆι θεῶι -
 XXXX|^{PH} -
 vacat

²⁸ Cf. p. 78 above, note 23.

A small fragment joins it on the left and preserves the edge, undoubtedly,²⁹ as may be seen in the photograph (Fig. 2), giving us the following reading:

. I
 [παρελ]άβομε[ν - - - - - π -]
 [αρέδο]μεν ἱερὸν [ἀργυρίον - -]
 . πίνακα ἀργ[υρὸν - - - - -]
 5 εἰα τῇι θεῶι - - - - - χρυ -]
 σίον XXXX¹⁷H - - - - -



FIG. 2.—IG ii.² 1503, WITH NEW FRAGMENT ON LEFT, FROM FOOT OF
 HEKATOMPEDON-LIST 1370 + 1371 + 1384 (403/2 B.C.).

The epigraphic evidence, afforded by the form and spacing of the letters, makes our attribution of this fragment to the stele practically certain; and any hesitation based on the unexpected formulae which it contains can be shown to be unwarranted. The word [παρελ]άβομεν in l. 2, and the mention of sums of silver (?) in l. 3 and of gold in ll. 5-6, point to some unusual transaction, for which the final lines of a later list, ii.² 1414, seem to afford a parallel. The clue to our proposed restoration lies in the word -εἰα at the beginning of l. 5, for which our first inclination was to restore [στέφανος χρυσὸς ἀριστ]|εἰα τῇι θεῶι, as in 1388, l. 29 f. and, still earlier, in 1402, l. 1.³⁰ As, however, the crowns so described were dedicated only at the great Panathenaea, it seems quite impossible that an object dedicated

²⁹ When I first copied this many years ago the fragment was complete, but cracked through: I re-
 JHS—VOL. LVIII.

found the missing piece and joined them together in 1931. [A. M. W.]

³⁰ Here as ἀριστέο[ν].

at this festival in midsummer 402 should be recorded among the annual accessions by the Treasurers of 403/2, although we have good grounds for believing that the new board came into office at the time of the festival.³¹ The proof lies in the fact that the crown dedicated in 398 is specified as an ἐπέτειον in the list of 398/7 (1388, l. 66 f.), and that the crown of 402 appears towards the end of the list of 402/1 (1402, l. 1) in a position which probably implies that it was an accession of that year. The conclusion seems obvious—namely, that the dedication of such crowns took place, or at least was officially acknowledged, after the new board had entered office. Having thus ruled out the restoration [ἀριστ]εῖα τῇ θεῶι, we suggest that the word was [πομπ]εῖα and that it stood in apposition to the word πινάκx in l. 4; and that the passage refers to the making of sacrificial vessels (πομπεῖα) from the confiscated property of the Thirty. We owe to Ferguson³² the suggestion that the silver hydriai of Athena, of which twenty-seven in all were dedicated by the end of 401/0, and of which the earliest mention is found in ii.² 1372 (402/1 B.C.), formed part of these πομπεῖα, and it seems a legitimate inference that the silver πινάξ and the χερνιβεῖον which normally accompanies it in the lists from 400/399 onwards³³ were made from the same proceeds. In these circumstances it would be in no way surprising to find a reference to the money obtained from the confiscation, and to one or more of the πομπεῖα already made, or in process of manufacture from this source, at the end of the list issued by the ταμίαι for 403/2.

A convincing restoration of these lines is not attainable, but we may go a little way towards making their purport clear. Assuming the average number of letters in each line to be forty-one, we find in ll. 2–3 [παρελ]άβομε[ν followed after twenty-eight letters by παρέδο]μεν ἱερὸν [ἀργυρίον - -], implying that the officials from whom the Treasurers received the sacred silver were indicated before the first verb, and those to whom they gave it over, between the first verb and the second. We can scarcely doubt that the first body were the ἀποδέκται, and that a board responsible for making the πομπεῖα would be styled ἐπιστάται (as in 420/19 B.C., *IG* i.² 379, l. 7 f.), and to them the ταμίαι would hand over silver to the amount required. When we observe, moreover, that our proposed restoration παρὰ τῶν ἀποδεκ- τῶν | παρελ]άβομε[ν καὶ τοῖς ἐπιστάταις τῶν πομπείων π[αρέδο]μεν gives us a line of forty (or perhaps forty-one) letters,³⁴ we seem to have made reassuring progress. As the transaction involved the handing over of silver for the making of vessels, and as we have πινάκx in the accusative, there cannot have been such a phrase as ἐς κατασκευὴν πινάκος, *vel sim.*; this compels us to insert [ἐς τὸμ] before πινάκx, and we obtain for l. 4 a line of forty-one letters if we restore it as reading ἐς τὸμ] πινάκx ἀργ[υρὸν καὶ τὸ χερνιβεῖον ἀργυρὸν, τὰ πομπ]εῖα τῇ θεῶι. This leaves us with a gap to contain about seventeen letters between ἀργυρίον and [ἐς τὸμ] πινάκx: it is

³¹ Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 138, note 2, seems to establish this conclusively.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 113, note 2.

³³ To this year we propose to date 1385 (below, p. 86), where this χερνιβεῖον is to be restored after

the πινάξ, in l. 15 f.

³⁴ It is probable, but not quite certain, that the Γ of [παρέδο]μεν was the last letter of l. 2, and not the first of l. 3, which is rather more crowded than l. 2.

possible that there was a reference here to the making of the hydriai, in which case there is not room for the epithet as well as the noun, for we obtain a line of forty letters if we restore $\text{ἱερὸν ἄργύριον τὸ ἐς τὰς ὑδρίας καὶ ἐς τὸ[μ] πῖνακα, κ.τ.λ.}$ West, on the other hand, whilst admitting the difficulty attending the supposed omission of the hydriai, proposed $\text{ἄργύριον ἡμέδαππον καὶ ἄσημον}$, assuming that the confiscated silver was not all in the form of currency; and it is perhaps most satisfactory to print both suggestions.

To complete l. 5 we should expect the amount of silver to be stated, without the word σταθμόν , and should perhaps insert $\text{τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τῷ δήμῳ}$ to emphasise the constitutional nature of the transaction. If we restore at the end of the line $\text{τὸ δὲ χρυ[σίου, κ.τ.λ.]}$, we have only about four spaces left for the weight of the silver. On the assumption that this was to suffice for making all twenty-seven hydriai of an average weight of 995 drs. as well as a πῖναξ weighing 1093 drs. and a χερνιβεῖον weighing 1050 drs., the sum required would be just over 29,000 drs. weight of silver, suggesting that a total of five talents plus a small amount to allow for the cost of making the vessels would be the natural restoration. On the other hand, if we omit mention of hydriai from l. 3, we should merely have to insert in our four spaces an amount large enough to cover the metal needed and the cost of making the πῖναξ and the χερνιβεῖον —say XXHH (2200 drs.).

Finally, it is not easy to understand in what form of transaction the gold, weighing over 4600 drs., figured. It is strange, too, that σταθμόν is not inserted before the figures, but this may be due to the use of the formula with the verb ἀγειν , with σταθμόν understood (cf. $\text{ἀγεί ἡ ὑπάργυρος - - (wt.)}$ in 1400, l. 39, and 1407, l. 24), enabling us to restore $\text{τὸ δὲ χρυ[σίου XXXXHH - - ἄγον - -]}$. It is impossible to say what the ταμίαι did with this fairly large amount of gold, which cannot be traced in any subsequent list of this series: in any case, these lists do not record the transmission of bullion or currency except in trifling amounts, representing individual dedications. The unusual presence of a formula recording a larger transfer, at the foot of 1414, seems the only parallel.³⁵

The restorations proposed for 1503 will accordingly read as follows:

. I - - - - (ca. 18) - - - - [παρὰ τῶν ἀποδεκτῶν]
 [παρελ]άβομε[ν καὶ τοῖς ἐπιστάταις τῶν πομπείων π-]
 [αρέδο]μεν ἱερὸν [ἄργύριον τὸ ἐς τὰς ὑδρίας καὶ ἐς τὸ-]
 [μ] πῖνακα ἀργ[υρὸν καὶ τὸ χερνιβεῖον ἀργυρὸν, τὰ πομπ-]
 5 εἶα τῇ θεῷ [τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τῷ δήμῳ τὸ δὲ χρυ-]
 σίου XXXXHH [- - ἄγον (verb).]

vacat

(Or, in l. 3, [ἄργύριον ἡμέδαππον καὶ ἄσημον ἐς τὸ-] (A. B. W.)

The Quadrennium 402/1–399/8.

The only list of this period which affords indications of an exact date is 1372 (402/1 B.C.). To this we have added 1402, a substantial fragment from

³⁵ This we hope to discuss on a subsequent occasion.

the foot of the stele. When these two stones were first published,³⁶ it was not recognised that they might belong together, in spite of the similarity of the lettering and the identical thickness, since the lower piece seemed to be of different marble from the upper; and moreover comparison was difficult, as they were at the time in different museums. Later, however, 1402 was transferred to the Epigraphical Museum, and when it was placed alongside 1372, there could no longer be any doubt that they came from the same stele (Pl. VII, on left). Not only did the forms and spacing of the letters agree, but the thickness of the slab and the identical rough dressing of the back afforded further proof, confirmed in turn by the flaws in the marble, which, as may be seen in the photograph, run obliquely upwards from the lower right-hand corner and appear to have caused the fracture of the left-hand side of the upper piece to follow the same line.

It is desirable to publish here a revised version of the prescript, since the new combination of 1370 + 1371 enables a more exact calculation to be made of the space occupied by the names of the Treasurers of 402/1. Misled by an erroneous notion of the length of the lines in 1371, Kirchner assumed that there was room there for the names of nine ταμίαι to be recorded as the new board for 402/1, whilst rightly recognising that in lines 2-5 of 1372 there is only space for seven names for the new board of 401/0, in itself an improbable reduction. We are in agreement with his assumption that the list of hydriai in l. 6 began with the words Ὑδρίαί ἀργυραῖ, but propose to insert the number ΔΔ before πρώτης. This line will then begin Ὑδρίαί ἀργυραῖ ΔΔ· πρώτης ὕδριας σταθμόν, κ.τ.λ. which locates the *delta* in ὕδριας as the twenty-third letter of the line, and thus the axial line of the stele, which comprises forty-six letters to the line in the catalogue proper, runs between this *delta* and the *rho* which follows it. This enables us to calculate approximately the letters missing to right and left of those preserved in ll. 1-5, since they are arranged strictly στοιχηδόν with those in ll. 6 onwards, but the fact that the engraver inserted punctuation-marks—*e.g.*, :: between ταμίαις and τοῖς in l. 2, warns us that the lines of the prescript may have contained fewer letters than forty-six. As our restoration shows, it is necessary to assume the presence of several vacant spaces to enable us to fit the surviving letters into the available space, and to reconcile the restored names with the length of those found in the prescript of 1370 + 1371. It may be noted that a similar use of punctuation is made in the prescripts of 1391 and 1392, where the names and demotics of the ταμίαι for 398/7 are carefully arranged with two in each line, but it does not seem that this practice was enforced in 1372. This suggestion overcomes the need for leaving an otherwise puzzling gap at some point in l. 1 or l. 2 between ἐγραμμάτεψε and τοῖς ταμίαις. Working backwards from the name of the Secretary Κλέσοφος in l. 1, and reckoning the number of letters required for the names of the receiving Treasurers in 1370 + 1371 (as restored above),³⁷ we find that four complete lines are lost from above l. 1, and that the blank spaces, presumably left at the end of each line, numbered respectively 1, 4, 2(?), 4. Allowance must be made for a slight degree of

³⁶ *JHS* 1908, p. 296, 2, and p. 301, 4.

³⁷ P. 79.

uncertainty, as it is unlikely that in every case the nominatives of name and demotic consisted of exactly the same number of letters as the datives in the list of the previous year.

For the names of the incoming board in ll. 3-5 we have some small additions to suggest. The first name must consist of six letters followed by Κ[ηφισιεύ], for in 1374, l. 10 we have the beginning of the Treasurers' names for this year, reading as follows: πα]ρὰ τῶμ προτέρων ταμ[ιῶν τῶν ἐπὶ Ξεναινέτο ἄρ]χοντος ΣΚ, which is presumably to be restored as [. ο]ς Κ[ηφισιεύς]. No other demotic in Erechtheis begins with *kappa* (for ἐκ Κηδῶν is out of the question), so this restoration, due to West, seems unassailable. In l. 3 the demotic of Polyeuktos, the second name, began with Γ, Ε or Γ, of which the upper left-hand angle is still decipherable, and Ἐ[ρχιεύ] would suit the requirement of a short demotic belonging to Aigeis.³⁸ As the third Treasurer we insert the name of the well-known Andokides of Kydathenai, whose tenure of the office of ταμίης can be dated within pretty close limits, apparently 402-399, but cannot be inserted either into the list of 402/1 or that of 400/399³⁹: nor can room be found for him in 399/8 or 398/7, as in the last three of these lists the representative of Pandionis is a different person. This leaves us with a name of nine letters at most for the representative of Oineis (vi) to which the demotic Ὀῆθεν belongs, indicating that neither Leontis (iv) nor Akamantis (v) were represented. Diodotos, whose demotic is lost, must belong to Kekropis (vii) or Hippothontis (viii), since there is clearly room for another name and demotic before the (lost) name of the last ταμίης whose demotic is Αἰγλιεύ. Otherwise we should have the impossibly large space of thirty-one letters to contain merely the demotic of Diodotos and the name of the last Treasurer. These restorations make it plain that there were seven ταμίαι recorded in ll. 3-5, the tribes omitted being Leontis, Akamantis, and either Kekropis, Hippothontis or Aiantis. The restored prescript will then read as follows:

- (1) [Τάδε οἱ ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας καὶ τῶν .]
(ca. 13)
 [ἄλλων θεῶν οἱ ἐπὶ Μίκωνος ἄρχοντος υυυυ]
(ca. 9) (ca. 20)
 [. Τειθράσιος υυ]
(ca. 11)
 [. κλῆς Αἰξωνεύς, Ῥίνων Παιανιεύς, υυυυ]
(ca. 10)
 (5) = 1 [. υυ, οἷς Κ]λέσοφο[ς Εὐωνυμεὺς ἐγγραμμάτευε, υυυ]
 [παρέδοσαν τοῖς τ]αμίαις :::: τοῖ[ς ἐπὶ Ξεναινέτο ἄρχοντος υ]
(6)
 [. Κηφισιεύ], Πολυεύκτωι Ἐ[ρχιεύ, Ἀνδοκίδηι Κυδαθην] -
(ca. 10) (19)
 [αιεύ, Ὀῆθεν, Διοδό[ττωι]
(12) (23)
 (9) = 5 [. Αἰ]γλιεύ οἷς⁴⁰
 [ἐγγραμμάτευε] (*vacat*).

³⁸ For another Πολυεύκτος Ἐρχιεύς, towards the end of the 4th century, see *IG* ii.² 3455 (= *P.A.* 11942).

³⁹ For Andokides' own statement as to his tenure of this office cf. *P.A.* 828, esp. p. 63, *ad fin.*

⁴⁰ The length of the name and demotic of the Secretary are unknown, and may have been followed by a number of vacant spaces, if, as we suggest, the verb only began in the following line.

The reconstruction of the record for 402/1, which we have just discussed, proves of considerable value in placing the other Hekatompedon-lists for the next three years (401/0–399/8)—namely, 1386 + 1381, 1385 and 1390. The combination of 1386 and 1381 (Pl. VII, on right), which was communicated to the Editor of the *Editio Minor* in 1931,⁴¹ seems to need no further justification, but the contents of the lower fragment forming the conclusion of the list call for discussion. It will be seen, in the first place, that the last two items are the same as the last two in 1402 (402/1), though the descriptions do not tally word for word—namely, three gold cups (χρυσίδες) weighing 480(+) drs. and the golden θριπῆδεστος dedicated by Kallion wife of Aristokles and weighing 2 drs., 1 obol. In 1381, however, is an *addendum*, separated from these entries by a blank space 0.07 m. high, which records the entry of the seven silver hydriai required to make up the total of twenty-seven as found in later lists (1401, 1400, 1407, 1424a, etc., and conjecturally restored in 1388). Obviously the original dedication consisted of the first twenty, of which the first record (down to No. 5 only) is found in 1372; the list appears again (practically complete) in 1385, of which the date remains to be considered. The latter is incomplete above and below, begins with the entry of the second hydria and gives six items after the twentieth hydria. Unfortunately it has never been re-found since Fourmont copied it in the eighteenth century, and it is not very clear whether it is engraved στοιχηδόν, or not; certainly the varying lengths of the lines favour the view that it is not στοιχηδόν. Our problem is to decide whether this is earlier or later than 1386 + 1381, and therefore to be allotted to the year 401/0, or to 400/399, in which case its rival will belong to the previous year. In favour of 1386 + 1381 being the earlier are the following considerations: first, the similarity of the script to that of 1372 + 1402, as noted above,⁴² and second, the identity of the last two items. This would imply, also, that the seven new hydriai were the only accessions of the year, which is not an impossible assumption. If, on the contrary, 1385 were put as the earlier of the two, we should have to assume either that the seven new hydriai were not added till the following year, or that they appeared at the foot of the list in a postscript, as in 1381. Neither of these is in itself unlikely, but further examination of 1385 reveals features which convince us that it cannot be satisfactorily inserted between 1372 + 1402 and 1386 + 1381. In the first place, it omits the word *τούτο, ταύτης, vel sim.* after *σταθμόν*, whereas the other two lists insert it, and further, it shows signs of re-arrangement—namely, in the position of the three χρυσίδες, which come last but one in 1372 + 1402 and 1386 + 1381, but in 1385 are moved three places higher up in the list. As we shall see below in the transcript, the order in 1385 is twenty hydriai, pinax, chernibeion, three χρυσίδες, Panathenaic crown, citharoedist's crown, Aristomache's crown⁴³ . . .; but in 1372 + 1402 the χρυσίδες come immediately after Aristomache's crown, and before the θριπῆδεστος which finishes the list. This displacement makes it almost incredible that a place can be found for 1385 between 1372 +

⁴¹ *IG* ii.2. Pars. ii. *Add.* p. 798.

⁴² P. 71 *ad fin.*

⁴³ Restored incorrectly as the crown dedicated by Lysander; see below.

1402 and 1386 + 1381, and we are accordingly justified in dating it after the latter, and assuming that the additional seven hydriai were again, as in 1381, entered separately at, or at least towards, the end of the list. Before we leave 1385 it must be noted that the restoration of ll. 19–20 as recording the crown dedicated by Lysander is clearly incorrect. West drew attention to the fact that in 1402 the crown of the citharoedist is followed by that of Aristomache (not by Lysander's), and as this is the order followed in 1388, 1393, and 1400, it may be expected here also. Moreover, the description στέφανος θαλλῶ, as restored in 1385, l. 19, is the right one for Aristomache's crown, but is never used for Lysander's which was no doubt a more massive dedication.⁴⁴ We may now transcribe the last lines of 1385 as follows:

- 14 [ΠΗΗΗ]ΗΠΔΔΔ[ΔΤΤΤΤΤΤΤ· εἰκοστή, σταθμὸν ΠΗΗΗΗΠΔΔΔΤΤΤ·]
 [πί]ναξ ἀργυρ[ῶς, σταθμὸν ΧΠΔΔΔΔΤΤΤΤΤΤ· χερνιβεῖον]
 [ἀργ]υρῶν, σταθ[μὸν ΧΠ ἀνευ τῷ βάθρῳ (?)· χρυσίδες τρεῖς στ -]
 [αθμ]ὸν ΗΗΤ[Η]ΠΔΔ[Δ. στέφανος χρυσῶς, ὁ δῆμος (?) ἀριστεῖ -]
 [ον Ἀ]θ[η]ναῖαι, στ[αθμὸν ΗΗΠΔΔΤΤΤΤΤ· στέφανος χρυσ -]
 [ῶς] θαλλῶ ὃν ἡ πό[λ]ις ἀνέθηκε τὰ νικητήρια τῷ κιθαρῳι -]
 20 [δῶ, στ]αθμὸν ΠΔΔ[ΔΠΤΤ· στέφανος χρυσῶς θαλλῶ ὃν Ἀριστο -]
 [μάχη]Ἀρι[σ]τοκ[λέος ἀνέθηκε, σταθμὸν ΔΔΠΤΤΤΤ· - - -]




FIG. 3.—IG ii.² 1390. HEKATOMPEDON. 399 8.

The other stele which we would attribute to this quadrennium, and therefore allot to 399/8, is represented by the fragment 1390 (Fig. 3). The publication in the *Editio Minor* needs correcting in a few small points: the weight of the first item should be shewn as [ΠΗΔΔΔΔ]ΔΠΤΤΤΤ: (not

⁴⁴ Lysander's crown weighs 66 drs., 5 obols, Aristomache's 26 drs., 3 obols.

as ending $\Delta \Pi \text{HH} [\text{HH} :]$, since clear traces of the last two drachma-signs, and the lower of the two dots forming the punctuation-mark are visible; in the next line we must read $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \epsilon \iota [\rho \delta \varsigma]$ (following Köhler in *IG* ii. 658) for - - $\chi \epsilon [\rho \delta \varsigma]$; and in the last line it is possible to decipher traces of the five letters following the B of $\beta \omicron \lambda \acute{\eta}$, so that it should be shewn as $\tau \alpha \upsilon] \tau \eta \nu \acute{\eta} \beta \omicron \lambda \acute{\eta} \acute{\epsilon} \nu [\acute{\epsilon} \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu, \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$

The order of the contents, as far as preserved, exactly follows that of 1386, though small differences of wording may be noticed, *e.g.*, in the description of the two gold Phocaeian staters (1386, $\Phi \omega \kappa \alpha \acute{\iota} \kappa \acute{\omega} \delta \upsilon \omicron \chi \rho \upsilon \sigma \acute{\omega} \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \eta \rho \epsilon$; 1390 $[\Phi \omega \kappa \alpha \acute{\iota} \kappa \acute{\omega} \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \eta \rho \epsilon \chi \rho] \upsilon \sigma \acute{\omega} : \Sigma \Sigma$). On the other hand, the order of the items in the list for 398/7—namely, 1388—is conspicuously different: not only do the $\chi \rho \upsilon \sigma \acute{\iota} \delta \epsilon \varsigma$ dedicated by Stephanos of Lamptrai which immediately precede the crown of Nike in 1390 appear in 1388 no less than thirteen places later on in the list, but the order of the crowns found in 1386, ll. 3–8 (but not preserved in 1390), is completely altered in 1388. As therefore 1390 on these grounds cannot be put after 1388, its only possible place is just before it, in 399/8 B.C. Having thus located it on the evidence of its contents, we obtain further confirmation from the lettering which seems identical with that of the Opisthodomos-list of the same year (1378 + 1398). In addition to the stop (:) occupying a space before and after the weight-signs, the wide-splayed *alphas* with cross-bars set rather low and sometimes a little crooked, the large size of the round letters and the tendency to make the upright strokes lean a little backwards, all seem to point to the same hand having engraved both stelai.

Before leaving this group we cannot overlook a problem which it raises. The only one of the four lists of which we have the beginning preserved (1372), commences with the list of the silver hydriai, whereas the earlier list (1370 + 1371 + 1384 + 1503) shows the golden Nike as the first item, as in all the later lists of the joint board of which we possess the opening lines (1388, 1393, 1400) and again after the boards were separated, in 386/5, (1407). In 1385, unfortunately, we cannot tell what items, if any, preceded the twenty hydriai. Two possible explanations occur to us: either that these hydriai, and perhaps also the silver $\pi \acute{\iota} \nu \alpha \varsigma$ and $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \acute{\iota} \beta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \omicron \nu$ which follow them in 1385, ll. 13–15, were regarded as acquisitions of such importance that they were given the place of honour in the year 402/1;⁴⁵ or that in this year there were so many accessions that a second stele was required to contain them, the first stele being devoted merely to the items transmitted from the previous year. The second suggestion receives some support from the fact that in the preamble to 1372 there is no space available for the restoration of the words $\acute{\epsilon} \nu \tau \acute{\omega} \iota \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omega \iota \tau \acute{\omega} \iota \text{ Ἑκατομπῆδωι}$, which we should expect in a list of the normal type, and moreover none of the items towards the end of the list, in 1402, is known in any earlier list—a fairly strong indication that they also are accessions of this year. It must be admitted that it would be an unparalleled arrangement for the Hekatom-

⁴⁵ We have drawn attention to the supposed allocation of silver for their manufacture indicated by the fragment (1503) from the foot of the stele 1370 + 1371 + 1384, belonging to the previous

year. As official dedications by the City, they might justly occupy, on their first appearance, the first place in the list.

pedon treasures, but we should remember that exceptional circumstances may call for exceptional measures.⁴⁶

On the other hand, we may well ask if the accessions were in fact so numerous as to require a second stele. Since 1372 ÷ 1402 belong to a massive slab, originally *ca.* 0.55 m. wide and containing forty-six letters to the line, allowing for a reasonable ratio of height to width it would be needlessly large for the list of twenty hydriai, the πίναξ and χερνιβεῖον and the not very numerous other accessions of the year.⁴⁷ In the following year (401/0) the stele represented by 1386 + 1381 was rather narrower (width 0.49 m., forty-one letters to the line), and presumably sufficed to contain all the Hekatompodon items, including the additions of the previous year. It seems clear, then, that lack of space on one stele can hardly have necessitated the use of a second in 402/1, so we may fall back on the first alternative, that the stele 1372 ÷ 1402 contained both existing items and accessions, with the hydriai exceptionally entered at the head of the list.

This still leaves us without a clear explanation of the absence of the words ἀριθμῶι καὶ σταθμῶι ἐν τῷ νεῶι τῷ Ἑκατομπέδῳ, as well as of the phrase παραδεξάμενοι παρὰ τῶν προτέρων ταμιῶν followed by the names of the preceding board, for which, it may be noted, a blank space is left available. It may be suggested that as the hydriai (and other πομπεῖα?) were recorded first, they could not be correctly described as received from the previous year's Treasurers, even if this was in fact true of the majority of the items that followed them in the list. On this view we may suggest that the words referring to number, weight and location were also omitted as being almost inseparable from the words παραδεξάμενοι, κ.τ.λ. The order assumed for 1372 + 1402 will then be (1) hydriai and other new πομπεῖα; (2) Nike and other previous dedications; (3) other new accessions of the year 402/1.

ALLEN B. WEST.
A. M. WOODWARD.

(*To be continued.*)

Sheffield.

⁴⁶ The separate list containing the Eleusinian treasures transferred to the Hekatompodon (1375) does not furnish an exact parallel, for it records a transfer from another sanctuary, and not a list of new

dedications.

⁴⁷ The hydriai, pinax and chernibeion together would only require about 18 lines (*ca.* 820 letters).

THE CHATSWORTH HEAD

[PLATES VIII, IX.]

Mrs. STRONG in her publication¹ of this head has described it fully and has discussed its place, as a work of art, in the history of Greek sculpture, and it is not my intention to discuss the head from those aspects. It is to be dated, as she has shown, to the second quarter of the fifth century, probably between 470 and 460. It probably represents an Apollo, and chronologically belongs to the group which includes the originals of the Cassel Apollo and the Terme Apollo, both marble copies of bronze originals. As to its stylistic kinship with these or other works, any discussion would be fruitless, for it would be impossible to arrive at any degree of probability in attempting to attribute either the Chatsworth head or the two Apollos mentioned to any one of the Greek artists of that age whose names are known, for we have little or no evidence for their style.

The head was acquired by the sixth Duke of Devonshire at Smyrna from H. P. Borrell in 1838, and, according to a note from the vendor, was reported to have been found at Salamis in Cyprus. It would be a natural presumption that a head in the market at Smyrna would have been more likely to come from one of the Greek sites of Western Asia Minor. On the other hand, the mere fact that an unlikely, rather than a likely, provenance was given to the head is in its favour, for there would presumably be no reason to give it an unlikely provenance unless it was correct. So the head may really have come from Salamis in Cyprus. Further excavation at that site may throw more light on the subject. In any case, in the later years of the decade 470-460 B.C. there was a renaissance of Greek influence, especially Attic, in Cyprus after the battle of the Eurymedon.

The recent loan of the head by the Duke of Devonshire to the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge has given me opportunities for examining it in detail, and as repeated and close examination has brought out some interesting points about the processes by which it was cast, put together and finished, my observations are here set down as a supplement to Mrs. Strong's previous full publication. The Duke of Devonshire has generously given me permission for this and for the reproduction of the photographs. In the course of my study I have received much assistance from Mr. Francis Thompson, Librarian at Chatsworth, to whom I owe the excellent photographs, and have profited much from discussing the head with many friends, especially Miss Gisela Richter and Professor Bernard Ashmole.

The head was undoubtedly cast by the sand-box process, which has

¹ *Antike Denkmäler* iv, pls. 21-23.

been described in detail by Kluge.^{1a} He has also ² shown that the earlier existing hollow-cast Greek bronzes were made by this method, probably from wooden 'patterns,' and that the *cire perdue* process ³ did not come into use until later, exactly when cannot now be known, but probably not much earlier than the middle of the fifth century. The lack of uniformity in the thickness of the bronze as seen in the neck (Pl. IX, 2) ⁴ and in the back of the head, where it is damaged, as well as the solidity of the nose and chin, make it quite certain that the sand-box process was used for the casting. Further, when cast, the head was little more than a bare skull, with no hair, no ears, no eyes, nor indeed any detail. This is natural, because for economical production the 'pattern' should be so made as to facilitate casting. All the incidents mentioned were added after the skull itself was cast, and the various pieces of the hair and the left ear were cast separately and attached afterwards. We can take these in order from the right side (Pl. VIII, 1, 2). First, A, the three short curled locks just by the outer corner of the right eye, were a separately cast piece and attached afterwards. Next the piece B, with six short and two long spiral curls, was cast separately and attached. After its attachment the straight edge of the joint at the top was smoothed over and any crack visible was filled with metal. Later, when all the other pieces with curls had been attached, the lines of the hair running down from the crown were engraved right over the skull and over the joint to the roots of the curls. Next come three similar pieces, C, D, E, which form the line of spiral curls running right round the back of the head (Pl. IX, 1). Of these C consists of three short and two long curls, D of four short and three long curls, and E of four short and four long curls. Each of these has a straight edge at the top, and the joints where they are fitted to the skull were filled with metal originally and smoothed over like the joint of piece B, and subsequently engraved to continue the lines of hair running down from the crown to the curls. These joints, however, were started by the violent blow which fractured the head at the back and appears to have been delivered rather more on the left side of the back of the head than the right. It seems therefore, as the detective novels would say, to have been delivered from the left front of the head by a right-handed person of powerful physique with a heavy blunt instrument. It badly damaged the back of the skull, all the more so because the metal at this place was rather thinner than elsewhere. It is now possible to see, owing to the starting of the joint of E, the piece towards the left side of the head, how these separate pieces with the curls were attached. At each of the two upper corners of the piece is a copper rivet which fastens the block of curls firmly to the skull, and the ends of the rivets can be clearly seen inside the head. Behind the left ear came another piece, F, now lost, which seems to have consisted of two or three long spiral curls falling down behind the ear, and

^{1a} Kluge and Lehmann-Hartleben, *Antiken Grossbronzen* I, pp. 82 ff. See also *Encycl. Brit.* 14th ed., s.v. Founding.

² *JdI* 1929, pp. 1 ff.

³ By *cire perdue* I mean the casting from a 'pattern' consisting of a thin layer of wax over a core of

some fireproof material; see Kluge and Lehmann-Hartleben, *op. cit.* I, pp. 91 ff., *Encycl. Brit.* 14th ed., s.v. Sculpture Technique.

⁴ Contrast the neck with that illustrated by Kluge, *JdI* 1929, p. 11, fig. 6, a wax cast.

perhaps two or three small short spiral curls touching the upper edge of the ear (Pl. VIII, 3). The three locks, G, in front of the left ear were also cast separately and attached. On the right side of this piece (Pl. VIII, 3) there seems to have been attached another long separate lock, which fell down over the front of the ear right across the lobe in such a way that the curved rim and centre of the ear were shewn projecting through a heavy mass of spiral curls.⁵ After piece G and the corresponding three curls on the right side, A, were attached, two long waving bands of hair, H and I, were attached, one over the right and one over the left brow (Pl. VIII, 1, 4). These are of approximately equal length, but do not quite meet in the centre of the forehead. Between their ends a bow of hair, J, also cast separately and attached, is inserted directly above the centre of the forehead. This is broken at the ends, and shews on the left side and centre a curious flattening which cannot have been part of the artist's original conception. It may have been caused by the head falling on this place, but it is difficult to believe that a fall heavy enough to flatten the bronze like this should have left the forehead and nose unscathed.

The curls, long and short, of the hair at the back of the head which are cast solid are so undercut and intricate that it is hard to believe that they were cast by the sand-box process. They may instead have been cast from solid waxen 'patterns,' but not of course by the *cire perdue* process, for they are cast solid, and not hollow. Even if the lines of the hair were cast with them, they were re-touched after casting. Indeed, they may have been cast plain and engraved later, for the edge of the curls at the back of the neck has not been chased, and seems still to reproduce the surface of the 'pattern.' This perhaps marks the point where the artist thought the chasing should begin, for what is not seen was apparently not engraved.

The left ear, K, was most probably cast separately and attached (Pl. VIII, 3) just before the pieces with the curls were attached. There seems to be no actual right ear. It was apparently meant to be imagined as hidden in the mass of curls. A lump of metal can be seen from the front under the short curls on the right, but this can hardly be the lobe of an ear, for it is set lower down than the left ear. There is another lump of metal under the curls slightly higher up which seems to be intended to represent the lobe of the ear (Fig. 1), but even so this would not make anything more than a distinctly rudimentary ear. In any case, it seems clear that the object was to produce the illusion of a right ear under the mass of curls. This asymmetry in showing the left and in concealing the right ear is confirmed by the position of the muscles of the neck, which seem to indicate that the head was turned slightly towards its right (Pl. VIII, 1), and was therefore meant to be seen more from its left side. Perhaps the right arm was raised and pointed outwards and the gaze of the head followed the arm. Such an attitude is, of course, similar to that of the Apollo of the west pediment at Olympia.

On the top of the head, in the centre of the crown, is a small hole (Pl. IX, 4), either a slight flaw in the casting or perhaps a help in the attach-

⁵ Compare the heads of the Cassel Apollo type, Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors*, fig. 194. Bieber, *Ant. Skulpt. u. Bronzen in Cassel*, pls. VII, VIII:

ment of something now lost, such as a *μηνίσκος*.⁶ Just in front of this, a small rectangular piece of bronze, half as thick as that in the head, measuring 0.025 by 0.023 m., is let into the surface of the crown (Pl. IX, 4). The cracks round the edges of this have been filled with metal, and they were chased over when the hair was engraved. This probably fills a hole left purposely in the top of the skull for a rod to hold the core in position.⁷ After the extraction of the core when the casting was completed, such a hole would naturally have been closed. The core was not entirely removed and parts of it still adhere here and there to the inside of the head, for instance on the neck (Pl. IX, 3). The eyes were also, of course, set in separately. The left eye has completely disappeared, but of the right eye the bronze



FIG. 1.—THE RIGHT EAR.

casing remains. This is an ogival bottomless box made of two small plates of bronze fastened at the angles. It is slightly narrower at the base or inner side than at the top or outside. The outer edges were cut to represent lashes now broken.⁸ The eye itself would probably have been fashioned of ivory, enamel or glass. The eyebrows were chased when the head was being finished after casting. Over the right eyebrow is a kind of 'finger-print' and there are slight traces of another over the left eyebrow. They can hardly represent finger prints on the 'pattern' if that was of wood as seems most probable. A wax 'pattern' would, if it showed one finger print, be likely to show many more. Probably then the finger prints

⁶ See the *μηνίσκος* from the Menelaion at Sparta, *BSA* xv, p. 149, fig. 142.

Olympia IV, p. 1, no. 1, pl. i.

⁷ Compare the archaic Zeus head from Olympia,

⁸ Compare Perdrizet, *Fouilles de Delphes. Mon. Figurés, Petits Bronzes*, etc., p. 43, no. 87.

represent a smoothing of the sand either by the finger or perhaps by a fine brush, possibly when the core was being inserted.

It thus seems clear that the casting and finishing of this head and of the body now lost were not a simple process, and can hardly have been accomplished by one man alone, but would presumably have been carried out by several craftsmen working together as those depicted on the Foundry Vase.⁹ First we can imagine that the locks before the ears, A, G, the left ear, and the hair over the forehead were attached, and then the back hair. Next perhaps the face was smoothed over and the lips,¹⁰ corners of the mouth and nostrils emphasised and the eyebrows chased. The engraving of the hair on the crown would follow, and finally the insertion of the eyes.

It is hard to tell now, but the rather straight line of breakage of the neck with lumps of metal adhering to it inside and its somewhat tubular appearance, suggest that the head was cast separately and then set on its torso. On the Foundry Vase, for instance, a head is seen lying on the ground by the side of a recumbent bronze figure which a craftsman is engaged in finishing.

It has been suggested that the head was crowned by a wreath. This is certainly a possibility because the ridge formed by the hair all round the head provides an ideal support for a wreath. Further on the right side of the head, just above the roots of the curls of piece B, is a small projection which resembles a metal nail and appears to have been driven through the bronze. This could have held a wreath in position,¹¹ and there is a possible corresponding projection on the left side. If there was a wreath, it was possibly of gold leaf, representing perhaps a wreath of bay. The theft of this may have brought about the destruction of the statue to which the head belonged.

This description of the Chatsworth Head was written independently, after close and repeated examination of the head itself and before re-reading Furtwängler's *Intermezzi*.¹² The observations of that great archaeologist anticipate mine in many points. He believed that the head had been cast separately and then set on to a torso. He noticed that practically all the hair had also been cast separately and attached. He believed, however, wrongly as we now know, that both ears had been cast with the head, and that both of them, left ear as well as right, were originally entirely concealed by the hair. He thus supposed that the right ear actually existed beneath the curls, and that the left was meant to be completely hidden by locks of hair falling over it, but now lost. He saw that the hair had been engraved after the casting. He remarked that this system of casting separately all parts of the hair that were difficult to cast and then attaching them to the head was usual in early Greek bronzes, and quoted in support the finds from Olympia¹³ and the Acropolis at Athens,¹⁴ to which can now be added the finds from Delphi.¹⁵ From none of these sites, however, are

⁹ Furtwängler-Reichhold, iii, pl. 135.

¹⁰ Perhaps the lips were enamelled.

¹¹ See Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles*, p. 277.

¹² Pp. 4 ff.

¹³ *Olympia IV*, no. 1, nos. 22-29, pls. i, iv, v.

¹⁴ de Ridder, *Cat. d. Bronzes tr. s. l'Acropole d'Athènes*, p. 220 ff., nos. 617-681. Of these no. 617 *JHS* 1892-3, p. 243, fig. 16) is apparently the front hair of a σφυρήλατος bronze figure.

¹⁵ Perdrizet, *op. cit.*, pp. 41 f., nos. 75-86.

there any locks of hair at all comparable to the pieces with the spiral curls, B-E, which hang round the back of this head, except perhaps one piece from Olympia, which does not represent the hair of the head.¹⁶ The pieces of hair found at such sites are mostly long single curls or strands of hair which might easily be broken off. Although his keen eye observed all these technical points, Furtwängler did not realise their full implication. Kluge¹⁷ has now made clear the meaning of such technical devices and their importance for the history and development of Greek bronze statuary. The Chatsworth Head, being cast by the sand-box process, can be regarded as another instance of the use of wooden 'patterns' and of their influence.¹⁸ It also seems to show that the process of fitting together a bronze cast in several pieces as depicted on the Foundry Vase was a normal practice. Therefore a bronze statue presumably owed the details and finish of its ultimate appearance to the work of craftsmen, and not to the hand of an artist, though the author of the wooden pattern would have created the design or composition of the figure, and would probably have superintended its translation into bronze.

Cambridge.

A. J. B. WACE.

¹⁶ *Olympia* IV, p. 15, no. 32, pl. v: Neugebauer, *Minoischen u. archaisch griechischen Bronzen*, no. 200, pl. 34.

¹⁷ *JdI* 1929, pp. 1 ff.

¹⁸ Wood, as Kluge points out (*JdI* 1929, *loc. cit.*), has always been the favourite material for 'patterns'

to be cast by the sand-box process and many instances of statues cast from wooden 'patterns' could be quoted, for instance, the Tomb of Richard Beauchamp at Warwick (Dugdale, *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, p. 321; Nichols, *Description of the Church of St. Mary, Warwick*, p. 30).

NOTES

The Monetary Reform of Solon: a Correction.

When discussing the monetary reform of Solon,¹ I adopted the view that he obtained his supplies of silver for his new coinage from Corinth: it was obviously necessary for the success of his scheme that he should get silver from some market other than Aegina, and Corinth appeared to be the only place that would 'fill the bill': she had a coinage on a standard independent of Aegina, with the same unit of weight for the stater as that adopted by Solon, and it seemed probable that the stations established by Periander on the Illyrian coast would enable her to procure silver from the mines in the interior. But recent research by Mr. John May has shown that these mines were situated much further from the Adriatic than had been inferred from Strabo's account²: the centre of the mining region was Damastium, and the site of Damastium, on the evidence of coin-finds, was clearly near Scupi (Skoplje) and the upper valley of the Axios. From here the easiest route to Greece is down the valley to the Thermaic Gulf, which in the seventh century B.C. was surrounded by Euboean colonies: it was not till the last quarter of the century that Corinth got a footing there at Potidaea. So it is highly probable that in that century a good deal of the northern silver went to Euboea: some may have gone to Corinth by the land route through Epirus and Acarnania, as the finds at Trebenische show good evidence of a trading connexion with Corinth along this line about this time, and at the end of the century the Periandrian stations in Illyria and at Potidaea doubtless secured a share; but that Corinth still got some silver from Euboea is shown by the recent publication of a Corinthian coin overstruck on one of Eretria of about 600 B.C.³

It would be, then, much more natural for Solon to get his silver from Euboea than from Corinth: the expenses of carriage, both from the mines to Euboea and from Euboea to Athens, would be less than if Corinth were the intermediary, and the line of traffic was more free from the risk of interruption by jealous competitors

than that from Athens to Corinth, at any rate until Solon had secured his hold on Salamis. This fits in with the evidence of the coins known as the *Wappenmünzen*: it has been generally agreed that these were all struck at one mint, and I was inclined to accept the theory of the late M. Svoronos that the mint was Athens, though I could not follow him in calling them all Athenian. Most of the types are well known as badges of Euboean cities; and, though unfortunately the text explanatory of the classification adopted by M. Svoronos in the *Trésor des monnaies d'Athènes* has never been published, from my conversations with him I think he was chiefly influenced by the patriotic belief that Athens was, even in the time of Solon, the centre of the Greek world, and so was more likely to supply Attica and Euboea with currency than to be dependent on any outside source. So I concluded that the coins with types other than Athenian might be taken as struck at Athens for the cities concerned, several analogies for which can be found in the history of Greek coinage: it is, of course, a common practice to-day.

An analysis of the recorded specimens of the *Wappenmünzen*, however, discloses a serious objection to this conclusion. If a mint is striking for outside cities, it is hardly likely that its output for any of these will in the long run exceed that for its home city. But the *Wappenmünzen* with the owl type, the only type of all those used that can be ascribed to Athens with any certainty, are comparatively few in number: they form only about 4 per cent. of the whole series, while those with the wheel of Chalcis are about 39 per cent., and those with the gorgoneion of Eretria about 21 per cent.: some of the less common types, such as the bull's head and the horse, may also be Euboean. It seems most probable, therefore, that they were all struck in Euboea, most likely at Chalcis, and that the owl coins were ordered by Solon when he determined to relieve the financial pressure on the farmers of Attica by devaluing the drachma: he used Euboea to break the domination of Aegina in the foreign exchange. It is consistent with this that the owl type does not appear in the *Wappenmünzen* till the latter part of the series: it was an addition to an established set of issues.

This also fits in better with the historical order

¹ *JHS* l. (1930), 179.

² Mr. May's account is now in the press.

³ Basel sale 22 '3 1937, lot 302.

of events than the theory which I held before. It is clear that the financial reform of Solon took place before the final capture of Salamis, till when it would have been risky to bring convoys of silver from Corinth. When Solon had re-established the farmers of Attica by his monetary policy, and developed manufacturing industries by his encouragement of metics, his next step was to get his products to the shipping centre which traded with the best market for them—to Corinth for despatch to the west; and it was then that the possession of Salamis became all-important to him.

Silver from either Corinth or Euboea would serve Solon's purpose equally well: what was essential was that it should come from a city outside the Aeginetan ring and make it possible to coin drachmas on his own standard. Here it may be noticed that certain criticisms of my former paper, in which I accepted the account of the reform given by Androtion, overlook the fact that the success of Solon's measure was due to Athens having been dependent on a currency originating in a foreign state, and so liable to the manipulations of exchange. A good deal of pity has been wasted on Androtion, from the days of Grote till now: Grote, as a banker, ought to have known better, but exchange problems are outside the range of the ordinary scholar, especially if he has the fortune not to hold investments in French *rentes* bought before the War. The statement of Androtion, that the Attic debtors paid their interest in the same number of drachmas as before, but in drachmas of less weight, might be repeated, with the substitution of francs for drachmas, in respect of French loans after the devaluation of the franc; his comment, that the debtors were advantaged thereby, while the lenders were not injured, is also true, so far as internal trade and finance were concerned, because the purchasing power of the Solonian drachma would be the same as that of the Aeginetan, in the Attic markets. One astonishing criticism of this theory was that it is unthinkable that two coins of different weights could have the same purchasing power—different weights of the same metal being obviously meant. A handful of current English silver will supply the answer to this: coins struck before 1920 have nearly twice the weight of silver in them that coins of corresponding denominations struck after 1920 have; but the purchasing power of a pre-1920 shilling and a post-1920 one is the same. The analogy of France does not hold here in the matter of injury, because the franc was devalued far too much, to one-fifth of its old value: Solon was a Wise Man, and only

JHS—VOL. LVIII.

devalued by 27 per cent.: so that there was no collapse of the drachma like the recent collapse of the franc. In short, Solon had realised that other people besides Pheidon could dictate how much silver was to represent a drachma in their own country, and that the terms of a contract made in Athens providing for a loan and repayment in drachmas could be satisfied by payment in the new Attic drachmas, although the loan had been in heavier Aeginetan drachmas; if the case were brought before an international court to-day, it is fairly clear, on the facts as known to us, that the verdict would be in Solon's favour.

Oxford.

J. G. MILNE.

Notes on Attic Inventories.—The new edition of the Attic temple-inventories of the fourth and third centuries B.C. (*IG* ii². 1370–1552, with the *addenda* in *IG* ii², pars. 2, pp. 797–810), which we owe to Dr. J. Kirchner, is a remarkable achievement, which evokes the admiration and the gratitude of all philologists and historians who have occasion to deal with these documents. Only those who know the stones themselves, all of them broken and many of them barely legible, can realise the labour, the patience, the minute observation, the careful study of the suggestions of previous workers in this field, which the editor has brought to his task. That some gaps remain unfilled and some problems defy solution is in the circumstances inevitable, and we shall best prove our appreciation of what has been accomplished by making some contribution, however slight, to the furtherance of the task. Such must be my apology for these lines.

In *IG* ii². 1419 we have a fragment of an inventory drawn up by the Treasurers of Athena at some time after 385–4 B.C. and engraved on a stele of Pentelic marble. In his edition of ll. 2–5 Kirchner makes use of, though he does not wholly accept, A. M. Woodward's restoration in *JHS* xxix. 182. Line 6 he prints thus

ἡμα ἰνῶC . . ΙΑ'ΙΙΙ' κάρτο[πτ - - - - -].

In the light of an entry in an inventory of the treasures of Athena and the other gods, ii². 1485, ll. 49, 50, σηματο[φ]ορεῖον χα[ι]λλ[ακ]οῦν (cf. ii². 1522, l. 33 [σηματο]φορεῖα: Π: in the list of the property of Brauronian Artemis), we need not hesitate to restore [σ]ηματοφο[ρε]ῖα ΙΙΙ. The break of the word after the initial letter causes no difficulty, for the inscription is engraved στοιχηδόν, and this involves disregard of the syllabic division of words: thus we find σ[ταθμόν] Η in 1450, ll. 4–5, κ[ύλιξ] in 1521, ll. 37–8, and π[ρός]

H

in 1521, ll. 33-4, and the list might be indefinitely extended. I cannot determine the difference between the σηματοφορεία referred to in the above-cited passages and the σηματοθήκη of 1469, ll. 97-8, and 1471, l. 49.

In a list drawn up in 320 B.C. by the Treasurers of Athena and the other gods we find the following passage (*IG* ii². 1469, ll. 142-4)

κάτροπτον ἐν ἐ[λύτρῳι - - - -]
NE . E . . N . I . HN - - - - -
· κάτροππα III - - - - -

With the spelling κάτροπτον (for κάτοπτρον) in Attic inventories I have dealt in *JHS* l. 34. That ἐ[λ]ε[φ]α[ν]τ[ί]ν[η]ν should be restored in l. 143 hardly requires argument, for the ν at the beginning of the line makes it unlikely that ἐ[λ]ε[φ]α[ν]τ[ί]ν[η] is in the nominative, followed by a word beginning with ν. Ivory very frequently figures in the Attic temple-records, and in particular we may note the appearance of a κάτροπτον ἐλεφαντίνην λαβὴν ἔχον, dedicated to Artemis Brauronia in 347-6 B.C. by a certain Aristodamea (1514, l. 23, 1515, l. 15, 1516, l. 3: in 1517, ll. 189-90, I suggest that [κάτροπτον ἐλ]ε[φ]α[ν]τ[ί]ν[η]ν [λαβὴν ἔχον] is a very probable restoration). I therefore propose to read in 1469, l. 143, ν ἐ[λ]ε[φ]α[ν]τ[ί]ν[η]ν [λαβὴν ἔχον]. This leaves four letters to be restored at the close of the line, for each line is engraved στοιχηδόν and contains twenty-five letters. The word ἔτερ|α irresistibly suggests itself: cf. ἐ[τ]ερον κάτροπτον in ll. 92-3, ἔτερα κάτροππα in l. 96, and other examples in 1471, ll. 46, 48, etc. To fill the seven vacant spaces at the close of l. 142 is not so easy a task. Almost certainly they record the material of which the mirror is made, but [χαλκοῦ]|ν, which most naturally suggests itself, is too short to fill the gap, and I fall back on [ἀργυροῦ]|ν as a possible, though far from certain, restoration. An alternative would be to restore ἐ[λύτρῳι]·κάτροππο]|ν. This gives, it is true, a line of twenty-six letters, but the objection is not necessarily fatal, for several times in this inscription (*e.g.*, ll. 10, 16, 21, 70) two letters are crowded into the space of one, especially if one of the two is ι.

To sum up, I restore the passage under discussion thus

κάτροπτον ἐν ἐ[λύτρῳι ἀργυροῦ]·-
ν ἐ[λ]ε[φ]α[ν]τ[ί]ν[η]ν [λαβὴν ἔχον· ἔτερ]-
[α] κάτροππα III - - - -

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oxford.

A Review of Mediaeval and Modern Greek. *The Link* will appear in May 1938, edited by Nicholas Bachtin. Contributors will include S. Baud-Bovy (Geneva), P. Bizilli (Sophia), T. Castanakis (Paris), P. Chantraine (Paris), R. M. Dawkins (Oxford), R. J. H. Jenkins (Cambridge), J. Humbert (Lille), L. Lacroix (Liège), F. H. Marshall (London), J. Mavrogordato (London), A. Mirambel (Paris), O. Merlier (Athens), D. Talbot Rice (Edinburgh), L. Roussel (Montpellier), G. Theotocas (Athens), P. Vlasto (Liverpool), A. J. B. Wace (Cambridge).

The main object of *The Link* is to interpret the past of Greece through its present and its present through the past, and thus to reveal the basic unity of Greek civilisation in all its manifestations and throughout its whole development.

Since the review aims at correlating all things Greek, it may include contributions dealing with the classical period—treated not as a closed and self-sufficient whole, but as a link in the uninterrupted chain of tendencies and traditions that leads to present-day Greece. Yet it is with the last, the living link in the chain, that we are primarily concerned. First, because its intrinsic importance and its true relation to the classical period are still ignored by many classical scholars. Secondly, because Modern Greece and its language are the only direct access we have to Greek civilisation as a whole—the only link in the chain that has not to be theoretically reconstructed, but is actually given to our knowledge and experience in all the living complexity of its growth and structure.

Fortunately there are classical scholars who are beginning to realise the unique importance of Modern Greek studies for getting a truer perspective and a livelier understanding of any of the earlier periods. The whole future of European humanism depends on a fuller realisation of this simple truth and on putting it into action. To bring this truth home and discuss its bearing on scholarship and education: to unite ever-growing numbers of Classical and Modern Greek scholars for a common task; to reach a new and more vital conception of Greek culture and its value for our future: these are the aims which *The Link* proposes.

Whether the work proposed can be carried on depends to a great extent on the readers. The review starts with no financial backing and with only one year of its existence assured. If it is to last, each issue must be provided for by the preceding one. *The Link* will appear three times a year, and will be published by Basil Blackwell, Broad Street, Oxford, to whom subscriptions

(£1 1s. per year; 7s. 6d. single numbers) should be addressed.

The University of Birmingham. N. BACHTIN.

Anthesteria. An illustrated inventory of the redfigured *Oenochorae* destined for the Attic *Anthesteria* (Beazley, *Oinochoe* shape 3), com-

menced by the late Prof. Frickenhaus and continued by Prof. Deubner (*Attische Feste*, p. 238: *Die Darstellungen der Choenkannen*), is to be completed and edited by the undersigned: information of unpublished examples will be received gratefully at this address.

Kunsthistorisch Instituut, G. VAN HOORN.
25 *Drift, Utrecht (Holland).*

NOTICES OF BOOKS

The Excavations at Erimi 1933-35 : Final Report. By P. DIKAIOS, with chapters by E. M. GUEST and V. SETON-WILLIAMS. (Reprinted from the *Report of the Department of Antiquities*, Cyprus, 1936, Part I.) Pp. 76; plates XXIX and text-illustrations. Nicosia, 1936. 9s. 6d.

This well-produced memoir contains the results of excavation on a primitive site, eight miles west of Limassol, on the east bank of the Kouris River. In a depth of 5.50 metres are thirteen layers of habitation, with mud-huts below, with hearths, post-holes, refuse-pits, and occasional burials, but circular foundations of rubble in the upper layers. Many stone implements, and flint flakes and blades, assign the whole series to the close of the neolithic phase; but one small copper chisel shews that a metal culture was imminent. The sequence of pottery styles, from a red-ware group at earliest to a remarkable fabric with red painted ornaments on white ground, gives Erimi its place between the earlier settlements at Khirokitia and Sotira, and the first Copper-Age tombs (to which corresponding settlements have not yet been found), with their characteristic red-polished ware, only remotely related (if at all) to the earlier red wares of Erimi.

It is remarkable that after nearly half a century of sporadic excavations in Cyprus, it is only in the last ten years that any traces of culture have been detected earlier than the fully-formed 'Early Bronze Age'; and also that, once recognised, by Dr. Gjerstad and Mr. Dikaïos, there should have been found over thirty sites of this earlier series, widely distributed, and already admitting classification into at least two main periods, with and without the remarkable painted ware so common at Erimi. How this fabric is related to early painted wares of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, it is too soon to decide; but there are small technical peculiarities which connect it with the fabrics of Ras Shamra IV, Sakje-Geuzi, Nineveh 2, Arpachiyah, and especially Tepe-Gavra. More puzzling are resemblances to wares of the First Neolithic period of Thessaly, on which Mr. Dikaïos lays special stress. In estimating the significance of the apparent breach between Erimi and the

Early-Bronze-Age tombs, it must be remembered that while no settlements have been explored corresponding with the latter, no tombs are known of Erimi period, except the few intramural burials at Erimi itself and at Khirokitia; and that it is premature to regard such intramural burials as habitual, in view of their small numbers over a considerable area and a very long period.

Both Dr. Dikaïos, and his colleagues, and the newly organised Department of Antiquities in Cyprus are greatly to be congratulated on this careful piece of excavation, and on the really ample and dignified presentation of it in this memoir.

J. L. M.

Missions en Chypre, 1932-1935. By C. F. A. SCHAEFFER. (*Académie des Inscriptions, Fondation Marius Fontane.*) Pp. ix + 163; 41 plates and 53 illustrations in the text. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1936. 75fr.

The excavators of Ras-Shamra, thanks to subsidies from the Fontane foundation and from the Conseil des Musées Nationaux, have been able to take busmen's holidays in Cyprus. The results of their expeditions, taking the form partly of inspection, partly of fresh excavation, are attractively and unpretentiously set forth in this volume. As might be expected, it is chiefly concerned with early Cyprus, and more especially with the Neolithic and Bronze Ages. Of the problems presented by Cyprus in these periods none can yet be regarded as definitely solved, and in this surprising island anything may turn up to upset an old or provoke a new theory. The book ought to be reviewed by an excavator familiar with the actual excavations; the present notice pretends merely to indicate the contents of the book and note a few points which strike a layman.

A palaeolithic settlement in Cyprus has not yet been found; what the Swedes regard as 'pre-neolithic' at the poor little settlement of Petra tou Limniti is probably neolithic (pp. 16, 117), in spite of the absence of pottery; for these people used perfectly made polished stone axes, and stone vases with relief decoration, and had evidently domesticated the ox, the sheep and the

pig. But a palaeolithic settlement may be found at any time: after all, it is barely a dozen years since the first traces of neolithic Cyprus were discovered. The excavations on the interesting neolithic site at Khirokitia are too recent to be noticed in this volume (save for a brief note in the addenda); there Dikaïos has found (but only in the top layers) pottery which he describes as resembling the sherds from the lowest layers at Erimi, the most important neolithic site yet discovered in Cyprus. Perhaps it should be called chalcolithic, since a fragment of a copper tool was found above the fifth layer from the top, and copper needles were in the cultivated earth. The gap between the cultures of Erimi, which in its later stages may come down to about 3000 B.C., and of the early stages of Vounous, which hardly begin before 2500, has yet to be filled; the resemblance between the red lustrous wares from the two places is only superficial. Recently Dikaïos, Georgiades and Casson have all said their say on the question: but one awaits with interest the full publication of Erimi and Vounous.

Chapter III (pp. 26-48) discusses the remarkable discoveries in the early Bronze Age necropolis of the latter place. The pottery from this necropolis can hardly be dated earlier than about 2500, and it may have continued to about 2100 (p. 36). The beginning of the Bronze (or rather Copper) Age in Cyprus can no longer be dated as early as 3000. This later dating is confirmed by the red polished ware at Ras-Shamra (p. 37). Now, the metal implements and weapon found at Vounous are not the work of an infant industry: also the prevalence of the native Cypriote dagger-blade or lance-head with hooked tang shews that the industry was native. It is thus certain that the copper industry was well developed in Cyprus during the Early Cypriote period. A special chapter (VII) is devoted to the question of the age of the copper mines, and the attempt of Davies to shew that there was no metallurgic industry in the island in prehistoric times is shewn to be unacceptable. In this connexion the existence at Katydhatia of a settlement occupied from the early Bronze Age onwards, as shewn by Markides in 1916, might have been mentioned.

At Enkomi, excavation in 1934 resulted in an important discovery—that of the settlement (going back to the beginning of the second, if not to the third millennium) which was served by the well-known necropolis, and which was deserted after the Bronze Age, and superseded by Salamis. The most remarkable find was a

hoard of bronzes, including a table supported on curved bands, which might have been designed within the last decade. Since the site of this settlement is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ km. from the coast, and since, even allowing for the silting up of the estuary of the Pedieus, it is unlikely that it was ever actually on the seaside, it is suggested that it might have had a maritime suburb, which has still to be discovered.

On the thorny question of the origin of the Mycenaean pottery found in Cyprus there are some pertinent observations on pp. 75 ff. Wasters, or vases deformed in firing, found in tombs at Enkomi; local imitations shewing that Cypriote potters as early as the fifteenth century were copying Mycenaean models: a *facies* of Mycenaean vases peculiar to Cyprus; potters' marks in the Egeo-Cypriote script painted under the feet of vases before firing, but occurring only towards the end of the fourteenth century on vases of inferior workmanship, never on vases of the late fifteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries, which seem to have been imported on account of their fine quality—all these facts, to which there are parallels at Ras Shamra, seem to be in favour of the hypothesis of the manufacture of Mycenaean vases in Cyprus. As to the potters' marks, those (numbering 28) known to the author in the museums at Nicosia and London, and from non-Cypriote sources, are illustrated in an appendix. They have since been included by Casson in his much fuller collection of such signs (*Ancient Cyprus*, pp. 98 ff.). In the recently published third volume of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition Persson has added to this material. The time is about ripe for a critical corpus of these signs, with reproductions in truer facsimile than Casson has attempted.

The above must suffice for an indication of the value of what is, up to the present, the most convenient scientific presentation of the existing materials for the archaeology of Cyprus before the Iron Age, and of the problem of its relation to Mycenaean and Syrian cultures.

G. H.

Ἡ Καταγωγή τῶν Κυπρίων. By K. P. GEORGIADES. Pp. xxi + 352: 22 figures. Levkosia, 1936. 4s. *Cyp.*

This book, which is dedicated to all those who have contributed to the development of 'Cypriology,' won the prize in a competition instituted by the Archbishop of Cyprus for the best essay on 'The Origin of the Cypriotes in the light of general scientific researches.' The author's essay seems to have been the only one submitted, but it was deemed worthy of the first prize by

the Committee of Examiners appointed by the Academy of Athens. It is now published, most of the corrections suggested by the Committee having been incorporated. The book would have been more effective if it had been drastically shortened. The author, in an artless preface, explains how, having from the days of his earliest philological studies been interested in ancient Cyprus, he was moved by the sight of the volume of Perrot and Chipiez, in which they say that the Cypriotes were Phoenicians, to prove that these distinguished authors were wrong. The announcement of the competition found him more or less prepared.

Artlessness is, indeed, a characteristic of the book. The author has evidently taken immense pains to read all that has been written on and round his subject, and copy much of it out. (It is odd, that being so, that he does not know or has not used, the leading book on the *Landeskunde*, Oberhummer.) He divides his subject into five parts—Geography, Anthropology, Language and History, Religion and Mythology, Archaeology. All of them would have been improved by pruning. Some twenty pages are spent on what is practically an exposition of the general craniology of the Greeks, and the other twenty on Cypriote craniology are very largely reproduced from Fürst and Buxton. Similarly, on approaching the question of the language, lists of pre-Hellenic place-names in general must first be copied out from Kretschmer and Blegen. The study of the dialect is preceded by a long account of all the Greek dialects. Throughout the book it is very difficult to disentangle the author's own views or contributions to the subject, from the mass of often not very relevant stuff from other sources: fortunately, however, there is a generous use of heavy type to express conclusions, and each chapter is provided with a summary. It is more than once made clear, that in the author's opinion, towards the end of the fifteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth the first Greeks—Achaean (Mycenaean)—were established in the coast-towns of Cyprus as trading colonists, and that by the end of the thirteenth the Achaeans had become fused with the Cypriotes, or Cyprus had become Hellenic; with the complete Hellenisation of the island, the population in no way differed from that of mainland Hellas, where the population of historical times was a mixture produced by the fusion of the Pre-Hellenes (from Asia Minor) with the Hellenes who descended from the North. With the first of these deductions few will disagree; much of the rest is, I fear, coloured by the desire to prove that the Cypriotes

were pure Greeks. Unfortunately if one thing is certain, it is that the Greeks themselves regarded them as aliens, as different from the pure Greek strain as the Libyans, Egyptians, Indians, and other strange peoples. A famous passage in the *Suppliant Women* proves that beyond dispute, but, unless I have failed to discover it in the text, the author does not discuss it.

The few illustrations are pathetically inadequate. The author deserves praise for his laborious attempt to deal with the problem set him, and it is unfortunate that the manner of its presentation should render it ineffectual.

G. H.

Archaeological Researches in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran. By SIR AUREL STEIN. Pp. xx + 267; 34 plates, 2 maps, 88 illustrations in the text. London: Macmillan and Co., 1937. 63s.

The indefatigable explorer, author of this work, planned in 1930, with the help of Harvard University and the British Museum, to resume his explorations in Turkestan. Finding this impossible, he diverted his steps to the Punjab and Southern Iran. In the former he made a careful study of the ground, which induced him to place Alexander's crossing of the Hydapes below Salalpur. In Iran his task seems to have been two-fold, partly cartographical, partly archaeological, and occupied the seasons 1931-3. He found numerous ancient sites, and at certain of them he dug trial trenches. He found 'chalcolithic' pottery, resembling that of Susa I and Persepolis at the sites notably of Rudbar (Kerman) Tal-i-iblis (west of the Hatil Rud river, Kerman), and at Tal-i-pir (Luristan). Pottery of the Bronze Age was found at Fauuch, Bampur, Katukan and Khur ab (Makran), while at Damba-Koh (Makran) the cemetery appeared to continue well into the Iron Age. At Chah-Husaini some highly interesting polychrome sherds were found. It cannot be said that justice is done in this publication to these pottery wares and their connexions elsewhere, although the book is large enough. A number of observations lead Sir Aurel Stein to think that desiccation due to geological movements has been the cause of much of those areas becoming desert in relatively recent times, though mitigated in antiquity by the introduction of the system of subterranean irrigation. He also visited many other sites of different ages, including Minab, and found fresh ground for identifying it with Old Hormuz, the ancient Hatmozeia.

R. D. B.

Argolis. Vol. I, Landeskunde der Ebene von Argos und ihrer Randgebiete. By HERBERT LEHMANN. Pp. xvi + 150; 8 plates and 1 map. Athens: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1937. 15 m.

This, the first part of the comprehensive study of Argolis by the German Institute, deals with the physical geography of the plain of Argos. It includes the triangle Argos-Mycenae-Nauplia with the foothills round the edge of the plain, the valley of the Inachos, the basin of Berbati, the Asine district, and the tongue reaching along the coast to Lerna. There is a good map based on older surveys, but corrected and improved by the author's additions. He begins by describing the whole region and its boundaries. Then follow sections on geological structure and history, climate, water supply, vegetation, habitation in the successive periods from pre-historic times onwards, communications, cultivation and agriculture, crops and flocks. It concludes with a summary of its historical geography. The whole is furnished, where necessary, with statistical tables and other material facts. The author is cautious and critical, objective and not theoretical. His sober weighing of evidence is well displayed in the question of the desiccation of the Argive plain. He quotes travellers of the nineteenth century who said that certain stretches were marshy and that in them rice and cotton were grown. Dr. Lehmann shows by the figures quoted of the underground water-levels that it is unlikely that these districts were really marshy, but that it is probable that they were water-sodden by streams which are now controlled. In the historical geography he does not apparently recognise the suggestion that the Early Bronze Age people reached the Peloponnese from overseas, from the islands to the south-east. He calls Tiryns the oldest of the fortresses, whereas recent research shows that Mycenae was equally old, and that other strongholds, such as Asine, were of approximately the same date. Indeed, it is almost impossible to say which is the oldest of the Bronze Age settlements in Argolis. As regards the increase of population since 1828, possibly some attempt might have been made to indicate how much is due to natural increase in peaceful times and how much to influx from elsewhere. In the western part of the plain after the expulsion of the Turks and the independence of Greece, hill-folk from Arcadia, especially from the Alonistena and Stymphalus districts, descended into the plain and occupied Turkish *chiftliks* whose owners had perished in the war. An example of this is the foundation of the modern village of

Mycenae. These are, however, minor points. The book as a whole is excellent, and as a detailed study of a limited area almost ideal.

A. J. B. W.

Altertümer von Pergamon. IX, Das Temenos für den Herrscherkult: 'Prinzessin Palais.' By ERICH BOEHRINGER and FRIEDRICH KRAUSS. Pp. x + 160, 46 text illustrations, 72 Plates, and 3 supplementary Plates. 85 m.

X, Die Hellenistischen Arsenale. 'Garten des Königin.' By ERICH BOEHRINGER and the late 'AKOS VON SZALAY. Pp. viii + 63, 3 text illustrations and 44 Plates. 48 m.

Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1937.

These two parts of the Pergamon publication contain the results of the work done in the two first seasons of the renewed excavations on the site, in 1927 and 1928, during which digging was carried out simultaneously in the 'Princess's Palace' and the 'Queen's Garden.'

Vol. IX begins with a tribute to Theodor Wiegand, who was in charge of the work, but died in 1936 before any results could be published of the renewed operations which he had done so much to bring about.

The 'Palace' proved to be a temenos consisting of a colonnaded court with rooms on two sides, and at one end a recessed chamber lying behind a wider antechamber extending the full width of the peristyle. Comparisons with the *Heilige Haus* at Priene and the Heroon recently excavated at Kalydon leave little doubt that this group of buildings was intended for the worship of the ruling dynasty. Four building periods, were distinguished, the first dating from the time of Attalus I., when the cult of the rulers was probably established; the second, or main period, in the time of Eumenes II; a third period of expansion at the end of the dynastic era; and the Roman age.

The buildings are described, their reconstruction is attempted and their date and purpose are discussed in separate chapters, while the small finds, including numerous brick and amphora stamps, are dealt with in an appendix.

The 'Queen's Garden' was found to cover the foundations of five long, narrow buildings, the almost certain use of which as magazines is confirmed by many analogies of Roman date.

But the constructional method, walls with a facing of small roughly dressed stones, laid dry but with few clamps, and a centre of rubble, the method always used at Pergamon for utility

buildings in Hellenistic days, leaves no doubt of their earlier date, though remains of such buildings are not known elsewhere in the Greek world. Arrows and stones used in catapults confirm the purpose of the buildings, but the excavators are of opinion that No. I, the widest, was probably used for corn, of which it could hold enough to last a thousand men a year.

The whole of the construction above the foundations is thought to have been of wood, and a careful reconstruction is given of No. III.

The small finds, dealt with in the last chapter, tend to fix the date of the earliest magazine, No. I, to the first half of the third century B.C., while the tiles stamped βασιλείων found in association with Nos. III-V fix them to the time of the Kings, and other considerations place these three between 230 and 160 B.C.

No. III was burnt by the Romans about 133 B.C. and possibly Nos. IV and V with it, and their ruin seems to have been completed by an earthquake.

In both volumes great care and attention to detail are shewn, and in both the plans and drawings and the photographs reproduced in colotype are up to the highest standard.

J. P. D.

Etruscan terracotta warriors in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. By G. M. A. RICHTER. (*Metropolitan Museum Papers*, no. 6.) Pp. 18; 24 plates. New York: the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1937. \$2.

It is no new experience for us to receive from Miss Richter a welcome enrichment of our knowledge of ancient art in the shape of some new masterpiece which suddenly appears in galleries of the Metropolitan Museum, but she has reserved her biggest surprise until now. She now introduces us to three pieces of Etruscan terracotta sculpture: firstly, a helmeted head on so colossal a scale that the statue from which it was broken, if in a standing pose, must have exceeded 23 feet in height. Secondly, a complete figure of an armed man standing over 8 feet in height up to the top of the crest—a superbly vigorous work, compared with which the Apollo of Veii, hitherto the standard of Etruscan achievement, looks effeminate; and, thirdly, another complete warrior 6½ feet high, but of curiously attenuated ‘Italic’ proportions. The colossus is thought to have been a cult-statue, the others votive offerings; the style is late archaic.

The construction of these huge figures is an interesting problem, and the technical chapter by Mr. C. F. Binns will be read with close

attention. The unexpected fact emerges that after the figures had been moulded the kiln must have been built up around them. The firing temperature, about 960°, was the same as that used for Greek vases; ‘to obtain this remarkably uniform heat treatment, the firing must have been maintained during a long period, possibly for months.’

As Miss Richter rightly says, Pliny’s statement that he had seen Etruscan sculpture measuring fifty feet can no longer be treated as an impossible exaggeration. We congratulate the Metropolitan Museum, not only on the possession of these admirable figures, but equally on the reticence which has kept them a secret during the long years they have lain in its cellars.

The Praxiteles Marble Group in Olympia.

By OSCAR ANTONSSON. Pp. 208; 26 figures in the text; 32 Plates. Stockholm and Cambridge University Press, 1937. 10s. 6d.

The author of this book, working under the auspices of Prof. Persson and Dr. Kjellberg, and other experts, here proposes an entirely new thesis concerning the statue of Hermes and Dionysos attributed to Praxiteles, now in the museum at Olympia. Having studied the extensive controversial literature which has recently grown up, he decided to examine the whole affair afresh. Aided by a series of photographs of technical details and of drawings he comes to the following conclusion:

‘that the marble group at Olympia, known as “Hermes carrying the infant Dionysos,” is an original by Praxiteles, altered in Imperial Roman times. The group represents Pan carrying the infant Dionysos, and probably originally also included a maenad or nymph sculptured by Praxiteles.’

The group was, he thinks, extensively damaged at some time and was ‘restored’ in Roman times. The ‘Pan’ originally wore a panther-skin over his back, tied round his throat, and falling ultimately over the tree-trunk. Mr. Antonsson first conceived this idea when he examined the surface of the back of the ‘Pan.’ It struck him that it was not so much an unfinished surface as a surface due to the radical removal of some previously existing object such as a cloak.

The author, having conceived this idea, proceeds to search for proof of its correctness. He finds, after a minute enquiry, that there are traces of horns and of a wreath of ivy: that the ears were once pointed, but have been made less Pan-like and more Hermesian by retouching and

recutting; finally he finds clear traces of the claw of the panther-skin that fell over the back of the tree-trunk, which was left relatively unfinished when the recutting was done.

So fully documented a book and so revolutionary a thesis requires a close scrutiny before acceptance can be recommended. Fortunately I have been able to check the book step by step in the museum at Olympia from the original statue. Having examined the most important points, I can state categorically that none of them are susceptible of proof. The ear is in fact not as shewn in the drawing (Fig. 3, p. 37). No trace of the once-pointed end can be detected. The leaves at the back of the head shewn in a drawing (Fig. 4, p. 42) are non-existent. Finally, to my intense surprise, I observed that the traces of the 'panther's claw' illustrated in the photographs on Plate 12 exist in the form of certain protuberances in what is a surface consisting wholly of *plaster restoration*. The lower area indicated as original marble on Plate 12 B and C does not exist at all, and the photographs on which the areas of reconstruction are marked in ink are totally misleading and incorrect.

I am therefore convinced that the whole hypothesis is a figment. Despite the care and almost excessive detail with which the author has worked it out, his premises are purely imaginary. It reminds me of the children's game known as 'faces in the fire.' After a hard scrutiny Mr. Antonsson's 'faces in the fire' disappear as rapidly as their prototypes.

I reached Olympia prepared to be convinced at least of some modicum of recutting and reshaping of the Hermes, after reading his book before my arrival. But on perceiving that the minor clues were moonshine and the major clue (the panther's claw) plaster, I felt a certain disappointment.

It is regrettable that it should be necessary to condemn this book in such outspoken terms. The author is obviously industrious and honest, filled with enthusiasm at what he thought to be his discovery. He has documented it with the greatest care and precision, and stated his case with clarity and in well-ordered English. But he evidently has no experience in technical studies of Greek sculpture, and has been badly advised to proceed with his enquiry.

The Hermes thus remains, a solitary statue, not part of a group. He also remains as Hermes, and as a very fine work of art. Whether he is from the hand of Praxiteles is a matter which must be decided on evidence other than that of the type produced by the author.

S. C.

Recueil Edmond Pottier: études d'art et d'archéologie. Pp. vii + 718, with portrait, 1 plate in colour, and numerous illustrations in the text. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1937. 80 fr.

This reprint of thirty-six papers by the late M. Pottier will be warmly welcomed. We are given not only the great series of essays, in particular those dealing with Greek ceramics, which are familiar to every student of Greek art, but several other papers which, scattered in various publications, might well escape notice, and which all testify to the breadth of Pottier's interests and the shrewdness of his judgment. The obituary notice in the *Temps* from the pen of M. Carcopino is placed at the head, by way of introduction, and the material is divided into four main sections: general history of art, Oriental, Prehellenic, and Hellenic. There is no need to recapitulate the various papers, many of which have passed into the ranks of the classics, but it was a happy thought to include the text of the original project of the *Corpus Vasorum*, the immense enterprise to which Pottier devoted the last years of his life and the growing success of which caused him so much pleasure. The task of editorship has been undertaken by M. Pierre Wuilleumier.

Perseus: a Study in Greek Art and Legend.

By JOCELYN M. WOODWARD. Pp. xiii + 98. 33 figures. Cambridge University Press, 1937. 10s. 6d.

Satyroi. By F. BROMMER. Pp. 60, 19 figures. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1937. 3 m.

'I have put together the material in this book in the hopes that it may partly fill a gap, or, at any rate, shew how big that gap is. Kingsley's *Heroes* offers to all children their glorious first sight of the Greek myths—but what is there to follow? With the more advanced teaching of Latin and Greek in schools, language and history are made the main study, while mythology and religion, with their artistic expression, are usually left to a few lifeless words in the notes or a hurried look at the Flaxmanised drawings of a small classical dictionary.' The defect in our system of classical education to which Mrs. Woodward thus refers in her introduction is a double one: we are not systematically taught the Greek myths; we are not enabled to see the forms under which the Greeks gave them visible expression. To some, including the reviewer, the bare bones of Greek mythology, the rapes, the murders, the inconsequential cruelties, will not seem to call for more earnest attention on the part of the young than they already receive. There is no canonical version of any

particular story; the average Greek probably had very hazy ideas about legendary characters not connected with his own locality, and throughout literature and art it is the selected episode rather than the connected narrative that stimulates the creative spirit. The story of Perseus, as Mrs. Woodward admits, is exceptional in having a logical shape. She collects the chief references to it in classical literature from Hesiod to John of Antioch, and we can contrast the boring narrative of Pherecydes with the ravishing episode of Simonides: Hesiod makes it the keynote for a melody of lovely names, Lucian lets us overhear a suburban tea-party among the less important gods of the deep. Did the story, as a story, matter very much to any of these authors—except perhaps Pherecydes?

The real gap in our early education is that, though we learn all about the enclitic τε, we take our degree at the university without having even heard of the Pan-Painter. Mrs. Woodward has collected thirty-three Greek illustrations of the Perseus story, in vase-painting, sculpture and terra-cotta, ranging from the seventh century B.C. to the first century A.D. Opposite each is printed a sympathetic commentary, telling why each artist set about his subject in that particular way. The text is excellent, and provides a charming introduction to Greek art which should be in every school library. The central theme of the myth has proved a good excuse for making an admirable anthology. Most of the illustrations are good, and include first-class material, but there are a few poor or over-reduced drawings (Figs. 27, 29: 4, 5, 8), and the bad habit of cutting round the outline of a vase with a pair of scissors still survives (Fig. 11 is awful: why not do it like Fig. 12a?). There is a list of sources from which the photographs and drawings are taken, but the book is not intended for the professional archaeologist who can refer to Kuhnert's article in Roscher's *Lexikon*.

Dr. Brommer is heavier going. He has attempted in a short but copiously annotated book to straighten out the problems of the satyr, the silen, the 'Bockwesen' and Pan, and the 'Dickbauchtänzer,' defining the nature of each and quoting examples of their appearances in early Greek art. Before the end of the sixth century Pan hardly detaches himself as an individual from the chorus of 'goat-beings,' whose home is the Peloponnese. A bronze group from Arcadia, probably of the late geometric period, is the earliest representation of the 'tragic' or goat chorus, and certain

lead figurines of goats from Sparta are convincingly identified by the author as 'goat-beings' instead of ordinary animals. The cult of Pan reaches Attica after Marathon; Pan himself is shewn in company with Dionysos, Hermes, a silen and a maenad, on a late B.F. krater, but as an individual he plays a very small part in Attic vase-painting. Commoner are men dressed up as 'goat-beings.' The figures who attend the birth of Aphrodite on a R.F. pelike from Rhodes are by the author considered to be evidence for the myth of a Chthonic Aphrodite who rises from the earth. (Buschor had interpreted the scene as the sea-birth from a satyr-play, in which the vase-painter's whim had led to the substitution of goat-dancers for the satyr-dancers who naturally belonged to it.) In the Peloponnese, Pan himself continues to be represented in minor sculpture during the fifth century.

The treatment of the *Dickbauchtänzer* is more debatable. Dr. Brommer takes the view that they are supernatural beings throughout, and represent the Peloponnesian equivalent of the Attic silen; Payne has, I think, produced convincing arguments to shew that at Corinth they are human beings dressed up with artificial padding. It would have been interesting to see an illustration of the mastos in the Musée Rodin, with a subject here interpreted as the Return of Hephaestus with fat-bellied dancers who, in the context, should be super-natural. These dancers appear in Attica on the 'komast' cups of the second quarter of the sixth century, obviously borrowed as artistic material from Corinth: Greifenhagen holds that at first they are human, and become divine only when elevated to the company of silens about the middle of the century. In Lakonia they are never shewn in divine company: the naked figure who pours wine for Hephaestus on a kylix found in Rhodes is not a fat dancer, and probably represents Dionysos. Dr. Brommer does not mention the kylix in Sparta with female padded dancers (*BSA* xxxiv, pl. 39a): referring to Greifenhagen's note, he explains the hairy, phallic men shewn on this kylix and a krater-neck (*l.c.* pl. 39d) as a *Zwischenstufe* between dancers and silens. They are probably mere caricatures. The fat-bellied dancers in Lakonian vase-painting of the second quarter of the sixth century were evidently copied from contemporary Corinthian vases; if the lead figurines from the Orthia sanctuary are really of the seventh-century date proposed by the excavators, we should have expected them to appear on vases years before they actually do so.

(Exactly similar figurines are dated to the sixth century.) The bottom-kicking dance had become known as a Spartan speciality in the time of Aristophanes (Lys. 82), and there is really no reason to assume that its exponents in sixth-century Sparta were other than human. Dr. Brommer claims that the σάτυροι mentioned by Hesiod are identical with the fat-bellied dancers of Corinthian and Lakonian vase-paintings; this seems hard to maintain, considering that Hesiod was a Boeotian and that the dancers do not appear in art outside the Peloponnese till the second quarter of the sixth century.

Dr. Brommer confirms the theory that the silen is of Attic origin, the earliest representation appearing on a B.F. sherd from Naukratis; he enumerates early examples from other districts, and attributes the development of the type in the fifth century to the influence of the Satyr-play.

Tragedy develops from goat-choruses like those of the late geometric bronze group from Arcadia: the satyr play is not a parallel development from the same origin, but a new invention of Pratinas, who introduced it to Attica together with the name σάτυρος, previously unknown there, but used in the Peloponnese for the descendants of the padded dancers. The name henceforward becomes in Attica a synonym for the native silen. Dr. Brommer remarks that when 'goat-skin,' 'goat-beard' are mentioned in fragments from satyr plays, they do not indicate that the performer was dressed to represent a goat: the goat-being had no part in this form of drama. Finally he gives a list of the satyr-play subjects to be found on Attic vases, and endeavours to relate these to plays whose actual authors and titles are known.

A work of this kind is bound to contain much controversial matter, for the evidence is so fragmentary, but Dr. Brommer is to be congratulated on having produced a connected story; the archaeological material here collected should be invaluable to future students.

E. A. L.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Italia 12 = Bologna, Museo Civico 3. By L. LAURENZI. Pp. 48; 50 plates. Rome, Libreria dello Stato, 1936; 90 lire.

This volume of the *Corpus* is devoted to the South Italian vases in Bologna from the Palagi and University Collections. The plates, which on the whole are of a higher standard than usual for Italiote vases in the *Corpus*, provide a useful addition to the ever-growing repertory of the

ordinary work of South Italian potters and painters during the late fifth and fourth centuries; there are no outstanding pieces on the score of either interest of subject or artistic merit. The descriptive text follows very closely that of Pellegrini's catalogue, published in 1900, and shews almost no acquaintance with any research on Italiote pottery after that date. This is a pity, and detracts seriously from the value of the volume, which has to be used cautiously, as so many of the ascriptions, especially to the fabrics of Lucania and Campania, are not at all reliable. No attempt is made to arrange individual vases within the broad classifications of Apulian, Campanian, Lucanian, by assigning them to related groups or to their actual painters, nor are approximate datings suggested. The only stylistic comments made are taken directly from Pellegrini, and serve for little but to revive the Saticulan bogey long since laid to rest by Beazley and Tillyard.

The Apulian vases (36 plates) call for little comment: all are thoroughly ordinary examples of that fabric and with few exceptions—notably 604, Pl. 26, 1–2 which is Campanian—correctly ascribed. Pl. 22, 1 is by the Amykos Painter and would perhaps be better classified as early Lucanian: another vase by the same hand (Pellegrini 287) has been omitted, doubtless because Pellegrini classed it as Attic.

The six plates devoted to Campanian vases (IV Er) contain many very doubtful attributions. Pl. 1, 1 and 14 belong to that curious group of barbaric-looking imitations of fifth-century Attic vases, especially Nolan amphorae (see Beazley, *Vases in Poland*, p. 77, n. 5), and should hardly be included in the same classification as ordinary Campanian red-figure. Pl. 2, 1–2 is by the Pisticci Painter, and would be better grouped together with the vases by the Amykos Painter mentioned above. Pl. 2, 5–6 is early Apulian, related distantly to the Tarporley Painter. All the vases figured on Pl. 3 seem rather Apulian than Campanian—the first two belong to the Lecce group, the third is related to the style of the Hoppin and Eton Painters. The first two vases on Pl. 4 are likewise Apulian, the third is Attic, and not unexpectedly assigned to the fabric of Saticula. Pl. 5 presents a good mixture—11 and 12 are Paestan (*JHS* 1935, p. 53; *Paestan Pottery*, nos. 228 and 28), 7 and 14 Lucanian, and 1 and 3 Apulian.

Four plates are given up to Lucanian vases. A confusing misprint labels Pls. 3 and 4 IV Dr instead of IV Gr, and both the vases on Pl. 2 bear the same numbers. The last four vases on Pl. 1 and the two column-kraters on Pl. 2 look

to me to be Apulian of the period of the Tarporley and Sisyphus Painters or a little later: I should hesitate to class any of them as pure Lucanian. The other two plates in this section illustrate a number of minor vases, mainly kotylai; the bell-krater is a late work of the Creusa Painter. The last section (IV Gs) contains one plate with two Paestan vases.

A. D. T.

Documents on Athenian Tribute. By B. D. Meritt. Pp. xi + 135: 2 plates and 16 illustrations in the text. Harvard University Press, 1937.

Professor Meritt has once again given to students of the Athenian Empire, and of its tribute-system in particular, fresh material for consideration, and fresh cause for gratitude. In the first two chapters of the present work he deals with the two decrees, *IG* i². 65 and 66, which bear on the collection and recording of the φόρος, and in the other four he turns his attention, with no less fruitful results, to some of the Quota-lists.

IG i². 65, of which the first satisfactory reconstruction was published by Wilhelm (*Ant. Akad. Wien*, 1909, 53 ff.), contains certain enactments regarding methods of collecting tribute, of posting the names of defaulters, and of procedure in certain consequential judicial proceedings, and makes particular mention of ἑγλογεῖς. Meritt argues convincingly that these were not, as usually thought, a board of Athenian officials, but local boards appointed in allied states, and in support proposes to restore in ll. 6-8 [ἡ]χιρεσθόν] ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ[ι] πόλει [φόρο] ἑγλογεῖας ἡτοπος ἄν] ἡεκάσταχοῦ[εν] Ἀθ[ῆ]ν[α]ις συμπαρ ἐγλέγεται] ἡο [φόρος], κ.τ.λ. which in turn involves a change in the accepted restoration of ll. 52-6, so as to indicate that the heralds were to be sent to the cities to order them to appoint the necessary ἑγλογεῖς. From the well-known allusion to Samians and Theraeans in l. 21 f., M. concludes that not only was Samos still paying off her war-indemnity from 440 *pace* Nesselhauf, but that Thera, which had been subdued and incorporated in the empire between the spring of 431 and the autumn of 430 for in *Thuc.* ii. 9. 4 it is independent, but in *SEG* V. 28 it already pays tribute, was also required to pay the expense of her own conquest. *IG* i². 66 is enlarged by the addition to the two published fragments of a third piece, forming the upper right-hand corner of the stele, which was extracted in 1926 from the later masonry in the west doorway of the Parthenon, but though all three belong to the right-hand side, and give us the beginning and end of the document, the middle piece joins neither of the others.

M. restores the text with a line of fifty-seven letters, and not thirty-six as in *IG* i², but is only able to extract continuous sense from four passages, of which the introductory formulae supply one. The others are ll. 16-22, 35-8 and 55-9 (end), and they are seen to show a striking similarity to the contents of the other decree (*i². 65*), with the difference, to which M. draws careful attention, that *i². 66* seems to deal with procedure for one year only, whilst *i². 65* contains permanent regulations, valid also for the future. From this he concludes that 65 is meant to supersede 66, which was the earlier of the two, 'perhaps by a year, perhaps by more' (pp. 59 f.). He does not propose an exact date for either, but thinks, with regard to *i². 65*, that 'its general purport and the far-reaching consequences of its provisions make it at least possible that it was passed at some stage in the proceedings connected with the assessment of 425 B.C.' and that 'the crowds of litigants from the allies' (cf. Pseudo-Xen., *Ath. Pol.* I. 16-17) 'may have been, in part at least, an immediate consequence of the decree.'

It is obvious that M. has made a contribution of first-rate importance to the understanding of these two decrees, and that it will serve as a starting-point for fresh enquiry. The reviewer cannot resist asking one or two questions forthwith: first, whether the interval between the two decrees may not be considerably more than a year, in view of the striking differences which they exhibit in the use of the aspirate (65 omits the H on nine occasions, including three restored words, 66 always inserts it except in *ἐκαστος*, l. 21), and whether, in view of this difference, more importance may not attach to the striking contrast between the hands of the two stelai—the elegant, individual quality of the widely-spaced script of 65, and the formless and crowded script of 66. Secondly, what is the purpose of the vacant space at the top right-hand corner of 66, presumably matched by a corresponding space at the top left-hand corner, which extends to a width of seventeen letter-spaces and a depth of thirteen lines? In the absence of all traces of anything having been attached to cover it, and as the surface is dressed as smooth as the rest of the stele, may we not infer that the blank space was occupied by a painting, presumably symbolising some process connected with the tribute-collection, just as does the relief with an amphora and money-bags partly preserved at the head of *i². 65*? Does the fact that no analogy is known for painted ornament on Attic decrees, apart from crowns, necessarily offer a fatal objection: and are there not actual traces of

painting still to be seen, notably a shield in three-quarter view, on the photograph reproduced by Meritt (p. 44, fig. 8)? Thirdly, may a suggestion or two be added as to the texts? In 65, l. 30 may we not restore the enigmatic letters - οθινε - as [hē]οθινέ[ν] or - ε[ι], on the theory that the mover of the amendment in l. 27 advocates, in view of the urgency, that the business be brought before an earlier, regular meeting of the Ecclesia, instead of waiting for that proposed 'ten days after the Dionysia' by the speaker in l. 13, and compare ἐκκλησίας κυρίας ἐωθινῆς in Aristoph., *Ach.* l. 19 f.? If so, ἐ[πρυτάνευε] can hardly stand after Κεκροπίς in l. 31. In 66, l. 14 f., perhaps σεμ[έ]ν[α]σ[α] - (11) - - τ[ε]ῖ δ[ε]μοσ[ι]αί[σ]ι σφραγ[ι]δ[ι] ἀποπέμπετο Ἀθ[ε]νάζε; and in l. 33 ἀπα[γ]ογ[έν] (in the sense of payment) seems a more likely suggestion than ἀπα[ι]τέσιν or ἀπα[ρ]χεν, though in l. 22 - ιαπαί - might be [τ[ε]ῖ] ἀπαί[τέσει] or [τ[ε]ῖ] ἀπαί[τ[ό]ντι].

In chs. III and IV Meritt returns to the *Lapis Primus* of the Quota-lists, and offers a most attractive restoration for the fragment added by Wade-Gery (*BSA* xxxiii. 101 ff.), confirming that this portion of the right-hand narrow face contains a summation of the first year's quota recorded at the top of the obverse face. Accepting the conclusion that the quota for one year is omitted, M. argues that the missing year is 449/8, (and not, with W.-G., 448/7), so that *SEG* V. 6 belongs to 448/7 and V. 8 to 447/6. Even more far-reaching are his conclusions, in ch. IV, as to the exact number of states and their payments recorded for 448/7, which show how many states defaulted wholly or in part, and what was the relation between the actual sum received and the assessment for the whole confederacy. The former works out as *ca.* 280 Talents, as compared with 322 if the partial defaulters had paid in full, and with 435-40 Talents if all members had paid in full. Comparing these figures with those for the four years 454/3 to 451/0, where he shows that in the first year of this period the total received was *ca.* 350 Talents out of an assessment considerably below the 'Aristidean 460 Talents,' M. attributes the relatively poor collection in 448/7 to the exceptional circumstances arising from the Peace of Kallias, which resulted in 'the unwillingness of the allies to pay tribute when their need for protection against Persia was thus minimised.' In ch. V M. successfully confirms his proposed date for *SEG* V. 25, as 429/8, as a result of deciphering a few more significant letters from the very faint traces surviving from the heading of the stele in question (cf. *Ath. Fin. Doc.*, pp. 3-25): and in ch. VI he skilfully

finds a home for some of the pathetic waifs collected at the end of *SEG* V. For instance, V. 40 finds a place in V. 11, and thus comes into conjunction with a small fragment, which when transferred from V. 12 makes a convincing join; and V. 43, which is shown to be an incomplete copy of a fragment in V. 4, is relentlessly abolished, after a career of imposture lasting nearly a century. These last two discoveries were due, among others, to the late Allen West, to whose untimely death Meritt alludes feelingly in his foreword.

Mention of a new piece of the Quota-lists from the excavations in the Agora (p. 78, note 5) serves further to remind us that discoveries of this nature are still far from being exhausted and we may rest assured that when Professor Meritt has any fresh material for us he will present it in the same admirable fashion, alike as regards commentary and illustrations, as his previous publications have led us to expect. Meanwhile, we turn with grateful appreciation to the volume before us. A. M. W.

Prytaneis: a Study of the Inscriptions honoring the Athenian Councillors.

By STERLING DOW. Pp. 258: numerous illustrations in text. (*Hesperia*: Supplement I) Athens, American School of Classical Studies, 1937. \$3.

Professor Dow gives us in this volume a comprehensive collection and discussion of the Attic decrees passed in honour of the Prytaneis. To the forty-six examples contained, but not grouped together, in the *Editio Minor* he has now added seventy-four, all found in the recent American excavations in the Agora, and one in a private collection in Baltimore. Thirteen of the new texts have already been published in *Hesperia*, but to more than one of them important new fragments have now been added, and six of the original forty-six have been enlarged and improved by the discovery of additional pieces. This mass of material inevitably includes some quite small fragments, but the editor has successfully fitted most of them into their approximate places in the chronological series, and makes them contribute something of value to his study.

From the analysis (pp. 1-30, in which D. lucidly summarises the results obtained from what is at first sight a dull and unpromising series of documents, we may with advantage borrow a few conclusions to illustrate the scope and interest of his book. The chronological landmarks in the evolution of these decrees are: (1) *ca.* 327 B.C., when a decree of the Demos honouring

the Prytany is first added to the list of the fifty Prytaneis; (2) *ca.* 260 B.C., when this decree is followed by a decree of the Boule, honouring officials of the Boule and the Prytany; (3) 88 B.C., when the decree of the Demos disappears, and that of the Boule honours the Treasurer of the Prytany alone; (4) *ca.* A.D. 120, when decrees apparently cease, and lists of fifty (or fewer) Prytaneis and various officials, including *δείσῑτοι*, of Boule and Prytany are set up. It is to the second of these periods that most of the 121 texts studied by D. prove to belong (Nos. 9-96). As to their contents in general: 'the pre-Sullan decrees should be taken in most instances as meaning exactly what they say; merely personal, petty self-honoring is post-Sullan' (p. 27); on the evidence of seventy-nine decrees in which the tribe concerned can be positively identified, the most favoured ones were not necessarily the largest (Erechtheis, believed to be of medium size, is honoured twelve times: Aiantis, the smallest, eight; Aigeis, perhaps the largest, only four); during the period of the existence of Antigonis and Demetrias, out of twenty-eight decrees the former receives two, the latter none; and from the figures as a whole D. concludes that the small number of awards to certain tribes does seem to mean that to some extent popularity and influence affected the choice of the Prytany to be honoured. Under the heading of procedure, it is interesting to see that there are no examples known of more than two tribes being honoured in the same year, and in fact only on three occasions were there two; and that whilst the decree of the Demos might, or might not (there are just ten instances of each), be passed in the Prytany of the tribe so honoured, the decree of the Boule was always passed in the following Prytany, unless it relates to the last Prytany of the year, when the prytanising tribe was bound to vote its own decree, since the bestowal of honours of this kind was not carried over into the following year.

Other points of interest that emerge include valuable fresh data for chronology, including the names of three unknown Archons (a second Euthykritos, and apparently a second Philon, both *ca.* 200 B.C., and Menedemos, 179/8), and inevitably an abundance of new prosopographical material, to which D. gives scrupulous attention and provides a welcome index; the sacrifices offered by the Prytaneis or their officials illustrate the cults and foreign relationships of Athens at the times concerned—*e.g.*, Artemis Phosphoros, whose cult is specially prominent soon after 132/1 B.C.: *θεοὶ σωτῆρες* and *σύμμαχοι* raise problems of relations with

Hellenistic rulers and of a possible alliance with Rome, which D. carefully examines. The vexed question of the officials who paid for decrees is clarified, and consequently Dinsmoor's conclusions (*Archons*, p. 203 f.) must be modified by the discovery that with one exception (No. 58) all the Prytaneis-decrees between 229 and 178/7, or possibly 170/69, are to be paid for by *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, but after that period by the *ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν*, but in neither case is the paying official ever assisted by a plural board. We may note also some valuable suggestions as to the composition and number of the *δείσῑτοι*, and finally, in the matter of the deme-order in which the Prytaneis are recorded, we find 'a general tendency for large demes to appear early in the list, and for small demes to appear late,' but many more Treasurers came from small demes than from large—in fact, 'the big demes did not run the government.'

The concluding chapter is devoted to *κληρωτήρια*. D. publishes photographs and full descriptions of eleven marble objects, mostly incomplete, which he is unquestionably right in identifying as 'allotment-machines.' Eight of these have been lately found in the Agora excavations, whilst the other three have been known for some time, but never satisfactorily explained. In shape they resemble gable-topped stelai, or perhaps rather small Attic grave-monuments, of which the significant features are a hole pierced in the projecting pediment, to receive a metal tube, with funnel-like top, into which the balloting balls were poured unseen from a jug and released one at a time from the lower end of the tube; and a series of horizontal slots cut into the recessed face of the slab, into which some form of label or ticket was inserted, bearing the name or number corresponding to the lot drawn from the tube. The number of the slots—and the size of the slabs—varies considerably: No. I has twelve slots, No. X probably had 550, No. XI may have had as many as a thousand. Six of them bear inscriptions which enable them to be dated to the period 162/1 to 156/5, and on the backs of two of them are actually inscribed the decrees honouring, and the lists of, Prytaneis and officials. Here are, in fact, second-century examples of the *κληρωτήρια* of which Aristotle makes mention (*Ath. Pol.* c. 63, etc.), and D. is surely right in concluding that in all the passages in Greek writers where *κληρωτήριον* occurs, such an apparatus, and not an 'allotment-room,' is referred to; and in view of their implied portability, he believes that the fourth-century ones were of wood.

The publication, it may be added, is of the

same format as *Hesperia*, and the generous provision of photographs, of all the new fragments and several of those in the *Editio Minor*, enables us to see what exemplary patience and skill D. has devoted to the decipherment of the texts. The only misprint detected by the reviewer is προέγραπται for προεγράφται (p. 195, No. 121, l. 25), where the photograph shows the latter reading clearly. Finally, a few small notes and queries which have suggested themselves may be submitted, rather by way of tribute than criticism. No. 57, is it possible that - ΟΠΕΙΣ -, which, as D. sees, cannot make part of a demotic, should be restored as [Κεκρ]οπεις, in spite of the fact that no other instance seems to occur of the insertion of the name of the tribe at the head of the list of Prytaneis honoured, and that moreover the genitive would be more natural? Or is this not, after all, a Prytaneis-decree? In No. 110, col. I, a few more letters are decipherable on the photograph than are given in the transcript: e.g., ll. 49-50, [Ἰ]α[ρ]τεμίδωρος; Ἰ[α]θ[η]ναιου; l. 52, [Διό]γνητος; ll. 55-6, surely Παρά[μο]νος. In No. 121, which consists of IG ii². 1073 and 1074, joined by D. the photograph shows in l. 13 an *upsilon* after τας, and it is more than likely that in l. 15 the puzzling letters ΣΚΩΔΕΣΤΑΤΑΣ are to be restored as θρησκωδεστάτας or rather, -- έστάτα σ --, the superlative adverb from the rare adjective θρησκώδης (for which the revised Liddell and Scott quotes only Vettius Valens, 104. 14), and that in ll. 16 f. we should substitute [ἐπι]γραφὴν for [ἀνα]γραφὴν ποιησ[αμένους] (?), followed by the text of the proposed dedicatory inscription on the bronze statues to be voted to the two benefactors. Moreover, we should expect (in l. 15) a request for permission from the Boule to erect these statues, and following for this line the wording of Dow, No. 119 (= IG ii². 1070), we suggest that the whole passage ran somehow thus:

L. 14, μερισμὸν καὶ τῇ[ν] πομπὴν (?) -- (ca. 15) -- ὡς εὐσεβέστατα καὶ θρη[σ]κωδέστατα σ[υν]τελέσαι, παρακαλοῦσι τὴν Βουλὴν ἐπιχωρεῖσαι ἑαυ[τοῖς] χαλκῶν ἀνδριάντων ἀναστάσει τιμᾶν αὐτοὺς καὶ τῇνδε τῇν ἐπι[γραφὴν] ποιήσ[ασθαι]. Ἡ Βουλὴ Τι. Κλαύδιον Ἀττικὸν Μαραθῶνιον καὶ Οὐ[λύμπ]ιουλλί[α]ν Ἀλ[κίαν] τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας[ς] τ[ῆς] εἰς ἑαυτοὺς, κ.τ.λ. Some such construction will alone link up the contents of ll. 15 ff. with the resolution of the Boule which begins in l. 20, but the proposed wording makes no claim to be infallible.

It is no exaggeration to say that Professor Dow's industry and learning have succeeded in producing a work of permanent value for the study of a neglected and obscure sphere of Athenian political institutions.

A. M. W.

Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua. Vol. V: Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea. Edited by C. W. M. Cox and A. CAMERON. Pp. li + 201; 64 photographic plates. Manchester University Press, 1937.

The American Society for archaeological research in Asia Minor is to be congratulated on the publication of the fifth volume of the *M.A.M.A.* series ten years after the appearance of the first volume; a good record of progress in view of the increasing difficulties in the way of archaeology in Asia Minor. The Editors of vol. V had to encounter and overcome the kind of difficulty that one has come to expect in Turkey; they arrived prepared for an expedition in one region, but had, when they found the district contemplated impracticable, to turn unprepared to the area surveyed in this volume.

Vol. V contains the fruits of an expedition undertaken in the Dorylaeum-Nacolea area from 26th March to 21st April, 1931, and forms a contribution towards a survey of Phrygia Epictetus. 323 monuments are recorded, of which forty-one have already been published. In addition, there are appendices containing texts copied by Ramsay, Sterrett, Koerte, Brandenburg and Schoenewolf.

The texts are prefaced by an excellent introduction, which discusses the topography of Dorylaeum and Nacolea and draws attention to the more important of the monuments. The peculiar features of Dorylaean 'doorstones' are dealt with, and a striking fact in Nacolean epigraphy—viz., the number of references to imperial slaves and freedmen—is noticed. Traces of Christianity in the pre-Constantinian era are rare in this region, and therefore the inscriptions, testifying as they do to the vitality of Paganism, are of special interest to students of Phrygian Paganism. Again, this is the only region in Asia Minor where the tomb is also a dedication to a deity; an essay on the Tomb as a Dedication deals with this point. The Dorylaeum-Nacolea area is the centre and home of the Zeus Bronton Cult; a valuable essay on this cult is perhaps the best part of the introduction. Vol. V contains sixty-four certain and eight doubtful dedications to Zeus Bronton, of which only nine have been published before, and, in addition, an appendix of eighty-nine Zeus Bronton inscriptions other than those published in vol. V.

The introduction is followed by a note on the pottery observed, compiled with the aid of Professor Myres and Mr. Casson. There is also a good map based on Kiepert (1914). Two new features of vol. V are the rendering of

Turkish names in the Roman alphabet as adopted in 1928 and the practice of recording after the description of each monument the name of the copyist.

It is a pleasure to record the excellence of the photographs, of which there are over 450, especially as archaeological photographs are often very disappointing, though we have come to expect a high standard in the *M.A.M.A.* volumes. The photographs of the districts in which the editors worked are interesting and valuable. If there is an occasional lapse from the perpendicular (as in plate 10, which gives minarets the air of the Tower of Pisa), we shall not grumble, in face of the wealth of topographical detail presented. There is a human touch in the photographs which show us the editors at work or ploughing through the snow in their hearse-like wagon, reminiscent of the Retreat from Moscow.

But the plates of the inscriptions merit the highest praise. Only those who have squeezed and taken photographs in the wind and rain (there were only ten sunny days during the expedition) can appreciate the excellence of the photographs and the high quality of the squeezes. It may seem captious to suggest that some sort of scale would have been welcome (this criticism applies to all the photographs in the *M.A.M.A.* series), though occasionally a self-conscious hand giving surreptitious support to a monument or a fez-less Turkish head appearing somewhat comically above a stone as in number 98 (1) or a Turk and editor as on number 321 (2), 'Patience on a Monument,' give a hint at scale. A small measure with ten centimetres marked alternately in black and white placed unobtrusively on the edge of each monument would help in estimating its size.

The description of the situation and ornamentation of the several monuments is exemplary. How different from the older and exasperating practice: 'an inscription in a house in Phrygia.' Every detail is noted, and the measurements are full. Perhaps it would be pedantic to ask for an indication of the spaces between the lines of the inscriptions, but it is occasionally useful in restoration. Almost every text can be checked by a photograph of the monument or of a squeeze, and letter forms and ligatures can be studied both in the photographs and in the numerous excellent sketches which accompany the texts.

The commentary is, following the practice of *M.A.M.A.*, concise, but helpful and fully illustrated from other publications. The note on number 40, with the three photographs on plate

21, forms an interesting essay with sidelights on ancient surgery in connexion with a discussion of the object depicted on number 40, which resembles the 'ceremonial clamp' found in the Thames in 1840 and now in the British Museum. No attempt is made at dating unless the monument lies outside the second and third centuries A.D. There is a full epigraphic bibliography and concordance of inscriptions from the Dorylaeum-Nacolea area, and an exhaustive set of indexes which greatly add to the usefulness of the volume.

Every page of this work bears testimony to the patience, industry and scholarship of the editors, and the volume as a whole gives a model of what a good corpus could and should be like. Nor will the appeal of the volume be limited to the specialists in epigraphy. Those who are interested in the topography, paganism and history of Phrygia Epictetus will find much of interest, as well as those who will take pleasure in an examination of the art and symbolism of the Phrygian doorstones. The standard of accuracy in the printing and the quality of reproduction in the photographic plates are of the highest, and the result is a handsome volume that is a delight to handle and to read.

The following seem to need correction:—

Index, p. 191 Φωτεινός R5. Text R5 Φωτεινός.

Index, p. 191 Χαρίτων 522; read 252.

Index, p. 194 ναός τοῦ 'Ο [. . .] 8; delete 8.

Index, p. 194 Psalm 69 (lxx) 1, 311; text of notes on 311 gives Psalm 67.

Index, p. 194 δοῦλος 23; delete 23. Wrong number?

Index, p. 198 θαλάμον 30; read θάλαμον.

Index, p. 199 κούρη 160; delete 160. Wrong number?

Index, p. 199 μουνογένους 28; delete 28. Wrong number?

Index, p. 199 συνομεύων 28; read 106.

Index, p. 200 Ἀττικός; read Ἀττικός.

Index, p. 201 Ἀπόλωνιος; read Ἀπολώνιος.
etc.

J. M. R. C.

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden, IX Band. Steuerlisten Roemischer Zeit aus Theadelphia. By HEINZ KORTENBEUTEL. Pp. ix + 268; 4 photographic plates. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937.

As reading-matter, tax-lists, whether ancient or modern, must be caviare to the general, and to many readers the records of the receipts from

the tax office at Theadelphia will be as dry as the papyrus on which they are written. Nevertheless, the editor of vol. IX of the B.G.U. has succeeded in extracting a certain amount of fairly interesting information from what seems unpromising material. It is an interesting speculation as to what idea future historians would form of British history if their only material were the income-tax returns which record that John Smith paid a certain sum on a certain date.

Much of the information thus extracted is purely conjectural. For example, the Berlin editor conjectures from the fact that 600 taxpayers are named in texts 1891, 1896-8 that the population of Theadelphia in the middle of the second century A.D. was 2000. The Columbia editors, Westermann and Keyes, from similar data conjecture 3000. While there may be no facts of first-rate importance to be gleaned from those monotonous tax records, there will be much of interest to the student of the mechanics of taxation, agriculture and economic conditions, Egyptian nomenclature and Roman provincial administration in the second century A.D.

The ninth volume contains texts numbers 1891-1900 in the B.G.U. series, and they belong to the same group as those edited in 'Tax Lists and Transportation Receipts from Theadelphia,' Westermann and Keyes, Columbia University Press, 1932. The dates of the documents vary from number 1891 dated A.D. 134 to 1900 dated A.D. 196. B.G.U. 1891 is parallel to the Columbia papyrus 11., 1a-b being written by the same hand; B.G.U. 1891 is in fact part of the list for A.D. 134, corresponding to the list from which comes P. Col. 11. 1a for A.D. 135.

In consulting a work such as this, the student finds the index as valuable as the actual text: it is good to know that in vol. IX the indexes are full and carefully compiled. The notes are very brief, but succinct and adequate. The time is now ripe for a monograph on Theadelphia which will take account of the vast amount of material which has accumulated since *Papyrus de Theadelphia*, Jougnot, Paris, 1911.

As is to be expected in such a piece of intricate printing, there are considerable typographical blemishes, none of which will, however, give anyone any trouble—e.g., page 7, line 41, and page 8, line 1, παταμοφυλακίας, page 21 πο(ταμυφυλακίδος). Breathings appear to be wrongly used (to judge by the lack of correspondence between index and text) on page 12, 1891. 26; page 33, 1891. 498; page 74, 1893. 627; v and u are interchanged as on page 63, 1893.

322; page 64, 1893. 350: accents go astray as on page 89, line 1 (διοίκησεως), and Liddell and Scott appears, pardonably perhaps, as Liddle and Scott on page 7, etc.

J. M. R. C.

Michigan Papyri, vol. III: Papyri in the University of Michigan collection, Miscellaneous Papyri. Edited by J. G. WINTER. Pp. xviii + 390: 7 plates. Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 1936. \$5.00.

Michigan Papyri, vol. IV, part 1. Tax Rolls from Karanis. Edited by H. C. YOUTIE, with V. B. SCHUMAN and O. M. PEARL. Pp. xvi + 437; 4 plates. Same press, 1936. \$5.00.

The first of these two volumes contains ninety-one documents, amongst which may be found representatives of nearly every class of 'papyrus'—Biblical, literary, mathematical, astrological, horoscopes, magical, libelli, official documents, petitions, tax-papers, contracts, accounts and letters. The general editor, Dr. Winter, has been aided by a strong team—Professor Boak in the legal documents, Professor Bonner in the magical, Dr. Robbins in the mathematical and astrological, and Professor Sanders in the Biblical and Latin, while Messrs. Macgregor, Pearl and Schuman have dealt with some of the contracts. Over a third of the documents have been published previously in various forms, and the editors have given careful consideration to the criticisms and conjectures which have been offered. As a result, we have a body of reliable texts, accompanied by excellent commentaries, which offer material to students in all departments of papyrology and form a most interesting collection.

There are two groups which are of special value as giving information on the economic history of the properties concerned over a period of years: in 182, 183, 193, and 200 (to which will be added two unpublished papyri in the Columbia collection) are records of the activities of a group of agriculturists about 180 B.C.: in 184, 195-8, and 199 details of the leasing of a plot in the reign of Hadrian. Such groups give what is probably a truer picture of the general conditions of the agriculturists in Egypt than official returns, and emphasise the exceptional character of the 'Zenon archive,' which relates to an enterprise which was probably unique.

It may be noted that the Ptolemaic documents provide some useful information on the vexed question of the currency. The import of 182 has already been discussed; but 173, if correctly

dated to the late third century B.C., shows that the value of the copper drachma had not fallen, as against silver, to the second-century level: various articles and four drachmas in silver were given as a pledge for the payment of 1300 copper drachmas, and not redeemed, which shows that the four silver drachmas were worth less than 1300 copper: by the middle of the second century they would have been worth 1600 to 1800.

Two of the more literary class of documents are of interest to the student of education, as well as to the philologist. 134 is a passage from the Book of Proverbs, on a wax tablet, which the editor suggests may have been written as a penance by a member of a monastery. The suggestion is intriguing, but, if it is correct, the copy deserved a second penance. 143 has the opening definitions of Euclid, apparently as memorised by a pupil.

The review of the second volume cannot be undertaken satisfactorily until Part II is issued, as Part I contains only the texts, and it would involve a vast amount of labour to summarise the contents—labour which would probably be wasted, as Dr. Youtie will doubtless have covered the ground more thoroughly in Part II. In the meantime we can admire and applaud the diligence which has produced Part I.

J. G. M.

Papyri in the Princeton University Collections, Vol. II. Edited by E. H. KASE, jr. Pp. xi + 130; 10 plates. Princeton: University Press; London: Milford, 1936. 14s.

In this volume are collected together several documents which have been published at different times in periodicals and a considerable number of shorter texts of various kinds. Of the former class the most important are nos. 15 (fragments of the Epistle of St. James), 20 (two edicts of prefect), and 82 (a dialysis): the republication has afforded opportunity for some improvements in the readings. The other papyri do not furnish much in the way of novelties: 21, a report on the Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα, supports the view that this was administratively distinct from the city: 29 refers to a raid of 'Libyans' in the Fayûm in the year 258, which is interesting as evidence of the weakening of the police arrangements on the edge of the desert: and 38, though fragmentary, is a useful example of a will in Roman form written in Greek. The last papyrus in the volume, 107, is an amusing specimen of a gnostic amulet against fever. The editing as a whole seems to have been carefully done, but there are some slips which should have been

corrected: the worst is 'Commodus' for 'Severus' in the introduction to 36.

J. G. M.

A Greek Papyrus Reader, with Vocabulary.

Edited by EDGAR J. GOODSPEED and ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL. Pp. xi + 108; 1 plate. University of Chicago Press, 1935. 7s.

This is a handy selection of representative texts, which should be very useful to students of later Greek and to all who wish to get some idea of the nature of the documents with which papyrology deals. The editors, while avoiding the more hackneyed pieces, have collected much that is of interest, and considering the limited number of documents (eighty-two in all), have managed to give a very fair idea of the range and variety of papyrological studies. Some not very happy attempts at a humorous topicality and 'modern instances,' presumably introduced in order to recommend the subject to students, might with advantage have been omitted: and the commentary seems at times too scanty for the readers for whom it is presumably intended. Nor is the volume free from errors and misconceptions. Nevertheless it is a useful and meritorious piece of work, for which there had long been a real need, and the editors are to be commended for their enterprise in undertaking it. The volume is not printed but photographically reproduced from typescript; but it is admirably legible and agreeable to use.

H. I. B.

Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Band I: Laut- und Wortlehre; II. Teil: Flexionslehre. By EDWIN MAYSER. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Pp. xv + 215. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1938.

This is the second instalment of the revised edition of vol. I of Mayser's great work, which, as it was published in 1906, whereas vol. II (in three separate parts) began to appear in 1926, was very much more out of date than the second volume. For reasons explained in part III, this second edition is being published in reverse order, beginning with the concluding portion, which appeared in 1936. With the publication of part I the undertaking will be completed, and it can never be added to by its author, who, as those who have followed its progress with interest and appreciation will learn with regret, died in May 1937. Fortunately this second part was then ready for press, and the materials for part I were in such a condition that Dr. Hans Widmann, who has taken over the task,

will be able to bring out the part without any undue delay.

It has not been necessary to introduce any important modifications into the plan of the work, which was soundly and conveniently designed from the first. It has even been possible to retain the numbers of the original sections, so that there was no difficulty in beginning the new edition at the end; but naturally the bulk is immensely increased. Part III has (without the index) 263 pages as compared with only 95 for the same material in the first edition, part II 202 as compared with 167: and the new edition is more closely printed than the old.

It is unnecessary by this time to praise Mayser's work. It is indispensable to papyrologists and to all students of the Greek language who wish to follow its development beyond the classical period; and it is much to be regretted that nobody has yet been found to carry on the story through the Roman and Byzantine periods.

H. I. B.

Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninenhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr. By E. WIKÉN. Pp. 211. Lund: Gleerup, 1937.

In this book Dr. Wikén undertakes a review of the Greek materials for a history of the early western Mediterranean. He has made no systematic call upon the archaeological evidence, although such evidence may often serve to establish the limits of Greek penetration, and therefore of Greek information, at any given period, and Dr. Wikén implicitly recognises its value by the good use which he has made of the recent archaeological surveys by Blakeway and Beaumont. But we may agree with him that the chief need of the present moment is a more methodical collection and discussion of the literary data, and in this work he has not only amassed a formidable corpus of information, but has also sifted and sorted it out with skill and good judgment. His account of early Greek contacts with the west is the most systematic that has yet been attempted.

In an introductory chapter on early conceptions of the world and underworld, Dr. Wikén distinguishes sharply between the nautical theories of the Minoans (a circumambient ocean and *Isles of the Dead*), and those of the continental ancestors of the Greeks. By combining the evidence of the *Odyssey* with that of the archaeological finds (or absence of finds), he defines more closely the limits of early Greek exploration, and the advance consequent upon

Colaëus' discovery of the Straits c. 630 B.C. He does not, however, take into account the geographical work of Festus Rufus Avienus as possible evidence for Greek navigation outside the Straits in the sixth century. In tracing the regression of the Greeks in the west after 550 B.C. he does not emphasise the relative ignorance of fifth-century writers, and especially of Herodotus, as compared with Hecataeus. But he rightly distinguishes between an earlier and a later attitude of Etruscans and Illyrians towards the Greeks: the former did not become unfriendly and piratical until 550, the latter not before the fourth century. In connexion with the intensification of piracy in the west, he ingeniously suggests that Alexander of Macedon intended to take up the question of the freedom of the western seas, and that the missions of the Italian peoples to his court (so far as they were historical) were designed to deprecate his anger or to spy out his movements. In support of this view it might be pointed out that 'freedom of the seas' was a regular part of the programme of Macedonian imperialists from Philip to Demetrius.

A few points of detail.—(1) Dr. Wikén postulates a tin route via the Rhine and the Ticinus to the Po estuary (where ps.-Scymnus locates the Cassiterides). It is true that amber came south and Etruscan bronze went north along this track; but it seems unlikely that a bulky article like tin was conveyed by such a difficult and circuitous route (presumably from Cornwall or Brittany). Granted a tin depot in the northern Adriatic, could this not have been for the supplies from Bohemia (which was probably also an early source of supply for Greece)? (2) The suggestion that the Celts invaded Italy across the central Alps is improbable. A casual remark of Heraclides Ponticus that they came ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων hardly weighs in the scales against Polybius' statement that they made frequent use of the western passes across the Alps, and against the finds of La Tène swords in northern Italy. (3) The story of the battle between Heracles and the giant Alebion in the Plaine de la Crau (near Marseille) hardly suffices to prove an early Greek knowledge of the Alps. Geographical names based on the root *alb*—comprise towns and rivers as well as mountains, and they extend far beyond the Alpine regions. (See the entries in Holder's *Altdeutscher Sprachschatz*.) (4) For epigraphic evidence of intercourse between Greek cities and Carthage, add *IG VII*, 2408 (a Carthaginian πρόξενος of the Boeotian League).

M. C.

Greek and Roman Naval Warfare. By W. L. RODGERS. Pp. xv + 555; 12 plates, 28 maps. Annapolis, Maryland: U.S. Naval Institute; and London: Stevens and Brown, 1937. 27s.

This volume is mostly taken up with a straightforward narrative of ancient naval campaigns in the last five centuries B.C. Its contributions to the discussion of ancient naval strategy are relatively limited. Admiral Rogers duly notes the limitations placed upon ancient war-fleets by the fact that galleys could not keep to the water for long; and he makes an important contribution to the understanding of ancient sea-fights by pointing out that, in the absence of effective artillery, such battles could not be carried to a decision without boarding—a factor which seriously discounted the value of greater manoeuvring power. On the other hand, he does not lay any continuous stress on the importance of sea-power in the Greek world, where a superior fleet could isolate its enemies and cut off their supplies.

Of particular naval actions it may suffice here to refer to the campaign of 190 B.C. in the war between Rome and Antiochus III, whose special features of interest are well brought out by Admiral Rogers, and to the battle of Actium. The author reverts to the view that Antony fought to win at Actium, and that Cleopatra's 'flight' was in reality a gallant attempt to break the enemy line. For a fuller recent discussion on Antony's plan we may refer to G. W. Richardson's article in *JRS* 1937, Pt. 1. It is tempting to believe that at Actium 'my women became men'; but if Cleopatra's squadron of sixty ships made a charge at an opposing line, how came it to miss that line entirely and to sail into a void?

On the whole the most valuable part of this book consists of the excursuses on the construction and manning of war-galleys, which contain useful data about the mechanics of oar-power and about the rowing vessels of Medieval Italy. Admiral Rogers brings further evidence to show that the quinquereme was propelled by teams of five men working a single large oar, and that its speed was below that of a trireme, but that it had room enough to carry artillery. This satisfactorily explains the progression from 'threes' to 'fives'—provided always that the quinquereme had enough stability to carry artillery. On the 'Super-Dreadnoughts' of the Hellenistic period little is said, and Tarn's explanation of their oarage-system is not taken into account (*Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments*, pp. 132 ff.). In regard to triremes,

the author makes the ingenious suggestion that these ships could be worked by rowers seated at three different levels, but that this method of propulsion was used on parade only, and that in battle the triremes were worked on the quinquereme system, with three men pulling on each of the thranite (*i.e.*, the longest) oars, and the two lower banks out of use. But would naval architects have built vessels with a dangerously high freeboard (for this would be the effect of seating at different levels), and trierarchs have drilled their crews in the difficult art of group-rowing, merely for spectacular effect? The 'trireme puzzle' will repay yet further discussion.

In one of his excursuses Admiral Rogers forsakes the salt sea in order to fix the numbers of Xerxes' army. Arguing from the presumable rate of march across the Dardanelles pontoons, he concludes that its strength lay between 158,400 and 224,000 men. This estimate is remarkably close to the computation made independently by Gen. Maurice, on a parallel line of reasoning (*JHS* 1930, 260 ff.). M. C.

Pen and Sword in Greece and Rome. By O. L. SPAULDING. Pp. x + 151; Princeton University Press, and London: Humphrey Milford, 1937. 9s.

Colonel Spaulding offers us in this book a pleasantly discursive *causerie* on military subjects that range from the functions of a field commander to those of a quarter-master and of a provost-marshal. Though he betrays an extensive knowledge of the ancient sources, and quotes the new Amphipolis tariff of fines for sentries caught napping, he has deliberately neglected the historical writers—on the ground that their general ignorance of military matters makes them unsafe guides—and has gone to the special handbooks 'de re militari.' He draws freely and with evident relish upon Xenophon, and lays Aeneas Tacticus under contribution. For Roman warcraft he utilises Vitruvius, Arrian, Julius Africanus and Vegetius; and he cites at some length the excellent Byzantine manuals of war. His extracts do not give much information on the main principles of ancient warfare: for these we must still have recourse to the historians with all their faults. But they throw an interesting light on many details of ancient army life, and the excerpts from the Byzantine writers will probably be a novelty to many readers of this *Journal*.

Essays in Greek History and Literature.

By A. W. GOMME. Pp. 298. Blackwell, 1937. 15s.

In this volume Mr. Gomme has re-published six articles, written between 1911 and 1934, and added five essays hitherto unpublished; so wide is the range of subjects that each demands separate attention. The re-published articles, being mainly polemical in character, are primarily concerned with controversies which have lost some of their pristine vigour; and I am inclined to doubt whether it is wise to reprint articles which are in danger of losing their background. Thus 'The Topography of Boeotia' is studied in relation to M. Bérard's theory of the isthmus route in prehistoric Boeotia: but it is difficult to judge the value of this essay without re-reading M. Bérard's work, the more so as M. Bérard has accused Mr. Gomme, so he tells us, of a 'lack of good faith.' In the matter of topography both have visited Boeotia, but so divergent are their conclusions that Mr. Gomme believed M. Bérard never to have visited the terrain; my personal experience makes me question Mr. Gomme's statement that the route from Athens to Thebes via Phyle is 'a hard two-days' journey ἀνδρὶ ἐνζώνον,' for, without wishing to imply a superlative, four of us walked in winter by that route in one day. Apart from the isthmus-route controversy, the essay throws little light upon the reason for Boeotia's importance in prehistoric times, for the archaeological evidence is not considered. The next essay, 'Traders and Manufacturers in Greece,' criticises Hasebroek's *Trade and Politics*, without doing justice, I think, to his main contention that trade had little influence in the political sphere, and contains an interesting sketch of the nature of trade and capitalism, especially in the fourth century B.C. In two short essays strong arguments are adduced against the views of Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Professor Woodhouse with regard to 'Sphakteria' and 'Mantineia'; Mr. Gomme is concerned rather with the validity to be attached to Thucydides' evidence than with topographical detail, and the last few pages of 'Mantineia' seem to me excellent in judgment. 'The Law of Citizenship at Athens' and 'A Forgotten Factor of Greek Naval Strategy' were first published in recent years; in the latter Mr. Gomme does not explain how the Persian intention to circumnavigate Euboea before Artemision accords with his general theory that ancient navies needed a friendly coast for the conduct of long-distance operation's (p. 197 and

note 3). Finally, 'The Position of Women in Athens' is an excellent attack upon the commonplace belief that that position was ignoble.

Of the new studies two are concerned with Thucydides. In 'The Greatest War in Greek History' he dismisses Macan's opinion of Thucydides' work 'from beginning to end a superb apology for Perikles' as 'one of the strangest misjudgments ever made by a sensible man,' and advances the belief that Thucydides judged the importance of the war by 'the amount of material and moral damage done'; this is to me a new but, in view especially of the chapter in Jaeger's *Paideia* on Thucydides, a wholly unconvincing interpretation. 'The Speeches of Thucydides' contains an excellent study of the implications inherent in the theory that Thucydides 'invented' the speeches, and good reason is advanced to shew that Thucydides did keep close to what was actually said. Here Mr. Gomme makes out a strong case, but it would have been stronger, if he had discussed the thread of general philosophy about war in its various aspects, which runs through so many speeches and would appear to be 'invented' by Thucydides (for instance, in IV. the Spartan speech at Athens and the speech of Hermokrates at Gela). In 'The end of the City-State' Mr. Gomme attacks the view that Chaironeia was 'fatal to liberty' and, after examining the position of the Greek states under Alexander and the Successors, concludes that the end of Athenian independence came in 262 B.C.; the argument is interesting and provocative, but it turns rather upon what we mean by 'independence' than upon what the Athenians meant—for Lycurgus *c. Leocratem* appears to me to answer the latter problem decisively. The last essay, 'Menander,' which I found most readable and enjoyable, is a valuable addition to the study of Menander's individuality as an artist, with special reference to his use of dramatic and stage conventions.

Regarded as a whole, this volume of essays is for some tastes too anxious to substantiate the author's view, expressed in a footnote (p. 198), that 'a great deal of folly has been written by historians from Herodotus to Beloch. . .'. But it has the great merit that the essays are provocative of thought and interesting in their originality of outlook; the present reviewer has found this especially true of those concerned with the position of women, the speeches of Thucydides, and Menander.

N. G. L. H.

Démosthènes et la fin de la démocratie athénienne. By P. CLOCHÉ. Pp. 333. Paris: Payot, 1937. 36 fr.

To the study of fourth-century history French scholarship, and Professor Cloché in particular, have made most valuable contributions. His recent book on the foreign policy of Athens from 404 B.C. to 338 B.C. is now crowned by a mature and well-documented interpretation of Demosthenes' career, which summarises in the form of a biography Professor Cloché's attitude to the great orator. The exposition consists of an introduction to the Athenian *milieu* of 354 B.C., a chapter on the general traits of Demosthenes' policy, a chronological description of his political career with a full analysis of the most important speeches, and a summary of his achievement, with a bibliography and an index. The picture of Demosthenes is clear-cut and precise; the style is so eloquent and lucid that, whether or not one is convinced by Professor Cloché, his book makes excellent reading, especially the final summary, wherein the issues involved in an appreciation of Demosthenes are analysed with a clear and impartial judgment.

As Professor Cloché remarks in his introduction, appreciations of Demosthenes have failed (and will fail) to win universal acceptance; and there are two respects in which this book challenges criticism. In the first place, the chapter on the social and economic background is slight in itself and is not correlated closely to the examination of Demosthenes' policy: for instance, the penury of the large pauper class at Athens is emphasised (p. 22), but is not applied to Demosthenes' attack on the Theoric Fund, the middle classes are expected to fight at any season of the year, but their position in the economic life of Athens is not explained, and the economic effects of the Social War are under-estimated. In the second place, because Professor Cloché finds Demosthenes' speeches to be in general 'exempts de contradictions suspectes et de déformations flagrantes de la vérité' (p. 35), he is inclined to assume without argument that Demosthenes and his supporters are 'les orateurs patriotes' as opposed to Eubulus and Aeschines, that the policy preached by Demosthenes in the cases of Megalopolis, Rhodes and Thrace failed because the wealthy refused to pay taxes, and that the régime of Eubulus achieved no progress (p. 68), while Demosthenes saw at an early date the significance of Philip's expansion. Yet, if we consult, not Demosthenes' speeches, but the facts of the years 355-49, it is clear that the recovery of Athens and the thwarting of Philip

at Thermopylae (which receives as little attention from Cloché as it does from Demosthenes) were due to the policy of Eubulus, who aimed at financial recuperation and refused to revert to the policy of haphazard imperialism, which had culminated in the Social War but was advised by Demosthenes: again, whether or not Demosthenes regarded Philip as a menace, he advised policies which disregarded that menace, whereas Eubulus both at Thermopylae and in preparing the alliance with Olynthus (which Demosthenes naively ascribed to fortune) contended with some success against the rising power of Philip. The view that Demosthenes until 342 B.C. was a political egoist and opportunist is certainly tenable: Professor Cloché would have strengthened his case if he had argued against it (as Pickard-Cambridge does in his *Demosthenes*) instead of ignoring the problem.

In the period 349-38 Professor Cloché accepts Demosthenes' contention that the failure in Chalcidice was due to an error of policy in invading Euboea (p. 85), and that the fate of Phocis was iniquitous (he does not mention in this context the proposal of the Octaeans, the Athenian treatment of Sestos, or the Theban treatment of Orchomenos); nor does he admit, as Pickard-Cambridge does, that Demosthenes deserted Phocis and later accused Aeschines of doing so. In treating of the years 346-42 he follows Glotz in holding Cephisophon as president of the Theoric fund to be an adherent of Demosthenes at that date; this belief rests on the fact that Cephisophon, like Phocion, was a general in the later campaigns against Philip. In these years there is one difficulty which is not argued very closely; if Demosthenes sincerely believed that Philip's aim was the destruction of Athens, why did he act in such a way as to invite Philip to invade Attica at a time when Athens was isolated? Why did Philip fail to take the opportunity which offered in 346 and wait until 341 to move against an Athens which could raise a coalition and hope for Persian assistance? If Professor Cloché had faced these problems, his book would have been more valuable; as it is, his interpretation is eloquent and attractive, but to some minds will appear dogmatic and occasionally evasive.

N. G. L. H.

Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit, I. By HERMANN BENGSTON. (*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, 26). Pp. xii and 235. Munich: Beck, 1937. 7.15m.

This book, by a pupil of Professor W. Otto,

deals with the office of *strategos* from Alexander to Ipsus, the period of the Successors, and is to be followed by a second volume dealing with the Hellenistic kingdoms. The period of the Successors has perhaps been rather over-written of late years, but I imagine it had to be fully done as an introduction to the second volume, which will presumably be the more important, and to which one will look forward, for the author writes clearly and has full command of his material. It is not easy during this time to find any governing principles. The author does his best to elicit some sort of order, and takes trouble to show, when he gets the chance, how the military functions of the *strategos* were beginning to pass into administrative functions; but he understands very well that he is dealing only with improvisations to meet the needs of the moment made by rulers struggling towards an order which was to come later. He seems to have collected every mention of a *strategos* which exists; but it may be a question whether late authors do always use the word in any technical sense, especially having regard to the dislike of the literary Greek for technical terms. There are some long and valuable discussions of particular subjects: I may notice especially that of the position of the *strategos* in Demetrius' League, with a revision of some passages in the Epidaurus inscription; that of the general command over the upper satrapies, which is very fresh; and that of Antigonos' organisation in Asia Minor, which seems well founded. There is a useful examination of the meaning of καταλειμμένος, and a pleasing feature is the very full notes on the cuneiform material. In fact, the notes are very full throughout, and make the book useful for reference; the one omission of a source which has caught my eye is over the position of Olympias and Cleopatra (p. 33), where the Cyrene inscription (no. 3, in S. Ferri, *Alcune iscrizioni di Cirene*) should have been noticed. To enumerate small points with which I disagree would serve no purpose, but there is one definite historical mistake of importance: he treats Polyperchon as legally regent, which is impossible. Antipater the regent had no power to create another regent: neither had Antipater's army any claim to represent the Macedonian people under arms, in whom, and in whom alone, the power to create a new regent after Antipater's death was vested. Olympias understood this well enough; so, no doubt, did everybody. Consequently the author's whole conception of Eumenes' position (after Antipater's death) is faulty; Eumenes as 'general' in Asia never had one scrap of legal authority, for there was no one

to give it him, and that was his worst handicap in his struggle with Antigonos, who *had* legal authority, to whatever use he put it. It makes Eumenes' achievement the more wonderful.

W. W. T.

Plato's Conception of Philosophy. By H. GAUSS. Pp. xxii + 272. London: Macmillan, 1937. 6s.

With this interesting little book the author (lecturer in philosophy at Basle) begins a planned series of 'Studies on Plato and Platonism.' The aim of the present volume is to prepare the way by distinguishing Plato's connotation of the term 'philosophy' from others in general use. Following Windelband's distinction of four types, it is shown that for Plato philosophy means neither natural philosophy, ethics, theology nor epistemology. It is, rather, an attitude and a mode of life—'an implacable crusade against ignorance.' Dr. Gauss has well characterised this Platonic view in its implications for the individual life and for social relationships; he does justice throughout to the moral and religious basis of Plato's thought, emphasising his inheritance from Socrates. The book is written in English, on the whole admirable: it has a foreword by Professor A. E. Taylor.

D. T.

A History of Cynicism. By DONALD R. DUDLEY. Pp. xii + 224. London: Methuen, 1937. 6s.

This book gives a survey of the whole field of Cynicism from Diogenes to the last years of the Western Empire. A first chapter deals with Antisthenes as traditional inspirer of the school; but the author insists that the tradition is a fabrication of the Stoics designed to establish their connexion with Socrates, and that Diogenes is in fact the first of the Cynics. The book embodies much new material accumulated since Zeller's day: it is carefully reasoned and fully documented (in the matter of notes, it may be questioned why some are relegated to the ends of chapters, an inconvenient place for reference, whereas elsewhere, as at pp. 126, 158-9, there are footnotes of considerable length). The studies of individual Cynics, from Diogenes onward, are well done: the author has made the utmost of the available material, and without over-much conjecture he in every case produces a living portrait of great interest. The connexions of Cynicism with other schools, particularly of course with the Stoics, are emphasised to the full; thus the career of Demetrius is associated with a detailed study of the 'philosophic op-

position' under the Emperors of the first century, while the wandering teachers of the second century are put into relation with the confused and credulous thinking of their time. Mr. Dudley concludes his admirable work with a brief survey of modern survivals of the Cynic spirit, as expressed in the pursuit of simplicity, individualism and independence.

D. T.

L'Égypte des Astrologues. By FRANZ CUMONT.

Pp. 254. Brussels: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1937.

This work, which has rightly been described by Mr. Tarn as fascinating,¹ is also extremely useful for at least two branches of study: that of astrology in Hellenistic and Imperial times and that of ancient *Kulturgeschichte*. It is sufficiently noticeable in the surviving astrological texts that they contain many presuppositions true of Ptolemaic Egypt, but not of Greece or Rome at any date: the author systematises this observation at considerable length, and in learned, but always very readable detail, thus at the same time shewing more clearly than before that the authors we have, whether Greek or Latin, go back to a tradition formed in Egypt under the earlier Lagids, and do not add to it or modify it much. An appendix, indeed, furnishes us with very plausible dates for some of the information preserved to us in a quite late text: Firmicus Maternus expounds the influence of the star Regulus in Leo as horoscope in terms which indicate either the times of Ptolemy VI Philometor or those of Ptolemy VII Physkon. There is but little, save a detail here and there, which can be brought much lower than the date (second century B.C.) of the original of these passages.

The matter of the book is arranged in two main sections, *Le gouvernement et la société* and *La religion et la morale*, which are further subdivided thus: under (I), 1, *Le Roi et la Cour*; 2, *Officiers et fonctionnaires*; 3, *Les Nomes*; 4, *Insécurité des campagnes*; 5, *Les villes*; 6, *Les jeux*; 7, *Les corps de métiers*; under (II), 8, *Le clergé*; 9, *Cultes étrangers et mécréants*; 10, *Culte des morts*; 11, *Les hôtes des temples*; 12, *Gnose et divination*; 13, *Magie*; 14, *Les mœurs*; 15, *Droit pénal*; 16, *Vie future*. Under each heading and sub-heading there is abundant documentation: the author pays deserved tribute to Mlle. Claire Préaux, who has supplied him with numerous additional references and some corrections in details, shewing again and again

specifically Egyptian characteristics. It is even possible to verify the persistent statement of the astrologers themselves that their ancient authorities were priests; the knowledge shewn of cities is poor, not that of an Alexandrian, but that of Egyptian cults is good, and much that is interesting is alluded to with regard to the curious non-clerical hangers-on of the great temples, from outlaws seeking asylum to *katochoi*. The standard of accuracy is, as usual very high; the reviewer has noted one small slip, on p. 153, note 4. Cassius Dio does not say that Septimius Severus 'fit rechercher . . . les livres secrets et les fit enfermer à Alexandrie dans le tombeau d'Alexandre,' but that he (a) took away all such books from the temple libraries, (b) shut the monument.¹

It is to be noticed that much good new material is got, by the exercise of scholarly criticism and acute perception of the Greek text which lurks behind some very bad Latin, from the *Liber Hermetis* published in 1936 by Gundel²: Cumont fully agrees with the editor as to the origin and date of that curious work.

H. J. R.

Euripidis quae in codice Hierosolymitano rescripto Patriarchalis bibliothecae xxxvi servantur photographice inlustrata cura et impensis J. A. SPRANGER. Pp. 4: 34 photographs. Florence: Alinari, 1937.

Mr. Spranger, who, as noted in this *Journal* (LVII, p. 109), has published facsimiles of two Euripidean MSS., Laur. 32.2 and Marc. 471, has now produced in facsimile an interesting addition to the Euripidean arsenal, 34 pages from a MS. (no. 36) in the library of the Greek Patriarchate at Jerusalem. It is a small book, apparently largely palimpsest; over the 34 pages reproduced there lies a particularly ugly ecclesiastical author whom I have not identified in a thirteenth-century hand; beneath there is a small hand of the end of the tenth century. The hand seems rather earlier than that of the Paris *Euripides grec* 2713. The later hand has not covered the whole of the earlier: as a rule the right hand portion of the original page is clear. Two leaves—that is

¹ Cassius Dio, lxxv, 13, 2. I take occasion, in this context, to supply an omission in my notes to Hyginus, *fab.* 136, 1, where I leave unexplained the expression *monstrum . . . si quis soluerit*. The Greek must have been τέρας . . . εἰάν τις λύσῃ, cf. Cumont, p. 161, for the professional σημειολύται or interpreters of portents.

² See *JHS* lvi (1936), 262.

¹ *CR* lii (1938), 34.

page 533—are intact. On the margins are scholia, considerably abbreviated, in the same hand as the text, but smaller. The fragments have been identified by Mr. Spranger. They contain portions of the Andromache, Hippolytus, Medea, Orestes (these are the most numerous) Phoenissae, very much the same plays that we find in Marc. 471.

The value of the new text and scholia it is for editors of Euripides to determine. We owe Mr. Spranger thanks for giving the world a new factor in the Euripidean pedigree. Early minuscule evidence for the classics tends to accumulate, complicates the *stemma* of authors, and disproves the nineteenth-century shibboleth that the oldest MS. was the parent of the rest. This office was performed for Aristophanes by the tenth-century palimpsest Laur. 60.9 *Hermes* XXVI. 128 sq.¹.

T. W. A.

Der homerische Apollonhymnos. Eine methodologische Studie. By ENGELBERT DRERUP. (Sonderdruck aus *Mnemosyne*, Bibliotheca classica Batava, series tertia, volumen V, S. 81–134). Pp. 54; Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1937.

In this long and agreeably written article a Homeric veteran, now professor in Holland, gives an account, almost a bibliography, of the operations of the critics of his country—from Ruhnken to Dornseiff and Jacoby—on the most important, historically, of the Homeric hymns, the only one of which there exists recorded tradition. It may seem curious that it should have been thought profitable to register this course of human labour. Much, if not all, of it will be generally admitted time and the good sense of humanity have reduced to dust: it has been a *perditempo*. The hymn remains where it was, no new facts have come to light, nor does it seem possible that any should. To have recorded this apostolic succession of critics, each dealing a cut to the hymn, is a symptom of German philological psychology. In that country there is a touching faith in undocumented criticism, by which the notions excited by a book in its reader are translated into the history, the composition and the

homogeneity of the book; a touching and pious duty also [to gather up what has been said before one.

These words should not be a discouragement. The end is not yet. Portions of the Catalogue of Ships, portions of Theognis, portions of this hymn, await the knife. *Avanti!*

T. W. A.

Alcée : Sapho. By TH. REINACH and A. PUECH. Pp. vi + 337. Paris: Association G. Budé, 1937. 50 fr.

This volume takes a worthy place in the valuable Budé series. Here are collected, and well arranged, all the extant poems and fragments of the two great poets of Lesbos. The work was begun by Th. Reinach, after whose death A. Puech carried it to completion, being responsible in particular for the writing of the two *Introductions*. The editors have profited well by the preoccupation of various other scholars with the texts of Alcaeus and Sappho in recent years, as is shown by the fulness of the critical notes and comments. As is usual in the Budé series, a French translation follows each section of text, wherever the completeness of the text allows it. The two *Introductions* deal, in praiseworthy detail, with the life, times, metre and MS. tradition of the two poets. It is natural to find considerable space given to an attempt to disentangle the truth from the legends which have fastened upon Sappho: and it is pleasant to re-read Reinach's pen-picture of her—'une petite femme brune, vive, de belle humeur et de franc parler, tressaillant à toutes les émotions de la nature et du cœur, malicieuse avec grâce, aimante avec fougue, de plus poétesse inspirée, musicienne accomplie et novatrice.' A very useful addition to the volume is the concordance between Reinach-Puech and Bergk, Edmonds, Diehl and Lobel. Note that, on p. 21 (note 1), Read should be Head.

C. H. V. S.

Essays in Honour of Gilbert Murray. Pp. 308. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1936. 12s. 6d.

Eighteen distinguished men and women have contributed the essays which make up this book. In nearly every case the choice of subject has either been suggested by some definite aspect of Professor Murray's work as a man in this generation of men, or is related in some way to analysis of the transmission of classical influences down to the present day. The resulting collection—which is an admirable foil to the purely academic studies collected in *Greek Poetry: Essays to be presented to Professor Gilbert Murray*—is one

¹ The Jerusalem book consisted of leaves from more than one old book, for on the edge of the photograph of pp. 282, 331, 332, 339, 340, 343, 358, 372, 390, 421, 422, 427, 428, 436, 443, 446, 573, traces of uncial writing in two columns can be made out, and at p. 440 and I think 524, 533, 540, there are signs of another minuscule hand.

of remarkable and splendid significance. Education, drama, international law and ethics, philosophy (to mention only the main subjects discussed)—there is a striking substance and variety in this catalogue of interests when they are considered as only a part of a life otherwise devoted to pure scholarship. And the contributors themselves leave no doubt of the qualities of directness and intimacy which have characterised Professor Murray's activities along these lines—qualities which are the whole justification of the two essays which epitomise the spirit of the book—namely, Professor J. A. K. Thomson's 'Present and Future of Classical Scholarship' (an earnest plea against specialisation) and Professor A. J. Toynbee's 'Greek Door to the Study of History.' It is impossible to mention all the other papers individually; but Dr. H. A. L. Fisher's charming and polished introductory essay 'Pignus Amicitiae,' Señor de Madariaga's 'Man and Leviathan,' and Dr. E. R. Bevan's 'Rhetoric in the Ancient World' may perhaps be singled out for the felicity with which material of absorbing interest is treated.

C. H. V. S.

Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday. Pp. 389. Princeton University Press, 1936. 22s. 6d.

Professor Capps' long, varied and distinguished record in scholarship and administration has been suitably honoured in this volume, which contains no fewer than 43 papers, by well-known classical scholars, on a wide range of subjects. A proportion of these studies is devoted, appropriately enough, to ancient drama, Greek and Roman: the latter category includes, in G. E. Duckworth's 'Dramatic Function of the *Servus Currens* in Roman Comedy,' a welcome contribution of unusual interest, and, in the former, W. N. Bates' 'Satyr Dramas of Sophocles' provides a useful summary of one of the lesser-known aspects of Attic Drama. Students of Greek sculpture will be grateful (among other papers) for 'The Labors of Herakles from Corinth' by Edward Capps, Junior, as well as for 'The Style of Skopas' by Charles H. Morgan, II, and for C. H. Young's 'Emotional Expression in Attic Grave Stelae.' For the pure linguist, too, there is much (including papers dealing with Aristotle, Horace and Catullus), while the fields of neither epigraphist nor historian are neglected. Finally, mention may perhaps be made of C. G. Lowe's 'A Description of Athens in 1588'—a fascinating and well-documented paper on a subject which

generally receives scant attention. It is unnecessary to add that the production and illustration of this volume are of the excellence to be associated with the country of its origin.

C. H. V. S.

Quantulacumque: studies presented to Kirsopp Lake. Edited by R. P. CASEY, SILVA LAKE, and AGNES K. LAKE. Pp. viii + 367: 20 plates. London: Christophers, 1938. 21s.

This attractive memorial volume contains a biographical note and thirty-five contributions of which the great majority are devoted either to palaeography or to Biblical criticism, and therefore need not be cited in the pages of this *Journal*. We may note the following papers: *A sellisternium on the Parthenon Frieze*, by L. R. Taylor, suggests that the scene in the middle of the East frieze generally described as 'the delivery of the peplos' is the folding of a robe to place over the chair of one of the gods. A. K. Lake, *The Supplicatio and the Graecus Ritus*, denies that the Roman *supplicatio* contains Greek elements. E. R. Goodenough, *Literal Mystery in Hellenistic Judaism*, examines the Philonic interpretation of the Jewish festivals. Silva Lake, *A note on Greek ciphers*, publishes cryptograms from MSS. at Grottaferrata. Father L. H. Vincent, *Aux origines de l'architecture Chrétienne*, reviews the problem with especial reference to the basilicas of Palestine. Campbell Bonner, *The Sibyl and Bottle Imps*, illustrates the story in Petronius of the Cumaeen Sibyl in an *ambulla*. T. R. S. Broughton, *Three Notes on St. Paul's Journeys in Asia Minor*, examines the route Perge-Antioch, the regio Phrygia Galatica, and the road to Alexandria Troas. Finally, Suzanne Halstead, *Paul in the Agora*, discusses the additions to Athenian topography resulting from the American excavations.

De typische getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos: I, Triaden, Hebdomaden, en Enneaden. By J. W. S. BLOM. Pp. xiv + 316. Nijmegen: Uitgeverij J. J. Berkhout, 1936. 9s.

This is an industrious collection of the occasions when Herodotus and Homer describe persons or things or events in groups of three, seven, or nine; and to shew that these numbers are not accidentally given, Dr. Blom has also tabulated the occurrences of other numbers from one to thousands and ten-thousands. The figures are impressive, but they include 'latent' triads such as groups of three speeches—address, reply, rejoinder—and speeches in three sections.

Hebdomads similarly include sequences of $3 \div 4$, $3 \div 2 \div 2$, and $2 \div 2 \div 3$. What should be added, for full statement of the matter, are the passages where a triad is associated with other numbers: e.g., in Hdt. vii. 191-2 with 1, 2 and 4, and another 2 in the first words of ch. 193; in vii. 196 with 15 and 2; in viii. 66 three triads with 2 (twice), 4 and 5. It has also to be remembered that for practical reasons small numbers and odd numbers of persons are preferred, as in modern committee work. But Dr. Blom makes a good case both for more or less deliberate imitation of Homer by Herodotus, and for the influence of folk-memory and folk-tales, which abound in rhythmic groupings. Less well founded is his denial of historical validity to triads, hebdomads, and enneads; especially in view of ancient and also popular predilection for these numbers, outside the scope of literary composition.

J. L. M.

Le thème de L'Adynaton dans la Poésie Antique. By ERNEST DUTOIT. Pp. xiv + 177. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1936. 30 fr.

The work of which a somewhat belated notice is taken in this review is a pleasant and readable essay on an interesting feature of ancient rhetoric. An *adynaton*, in late Latin *impossibile*, is that figure familiar in common parlance in such locutions as 'when that happens, there will be a great many moons in the sky.' In antiquity it is used mostly, though by no means invariably, with a temporal particle, 'this shall never be so long as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west,' 'this shall endure as long as water flows and trees grow,' and the like. Professor Dutoit traces its use from Homer down to Martial and Juvenal, with a view not so much of classifying its types or introducing a more exact terminology for it than the ancients employed, as of seeing to what extent the later poets imitated the earlier ones in this matter—in other words, whether by the age of Augustus or Domitian such phrases were fresh reminiscences of living speech or mere clichés. The results are rather interesting. The Greeks are sparing of this figure; Homer furnishes but two instances (A 233 *sqq.* and Φ 262 *sqq.*), the fragments of Archilochos one (frag. 74 Diehl, much imitated in later times), the tragedians five, three from Euripides, including the famous $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \pi\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ (Med. 410), and even the pastoral poets and the epigrammatists not an inordinate number; oracles seem to have been fond of the figure, including the motif, familiar from folk-tales also, of the seeming impossibility which turns out to

be possible and is accomplished in some unexpected way (as in the Delphic oracle, Paus. x, 37, 6). But the Latins, from Vergil on, make much freer use of it, till it becomes a positive obsession with those poets who were especially influenced by the rhetoric of the Silver Age. Ovid bulks large with twenty-eight such passages, some quite long, but Propertius, with six in about one-ninth as great a bulk as Ovid's, is proportionately even freer with his *impossibilia*. Seneca's tragedies yield many examples, the Silver epic poets are more restrained, following the convention of their art; Calpurnius, as part of the bucolic technique, has two very well-worn ones, varied from some of Vergil's in the most artificial way. Statius in the *Silvae* has half a dozen, Martial but four, Juvenal one only, and that given a new and savagely satirical turn, x, 218 *sqq.* It had, in fact, become a commonplace of rhetoric, novelty being sought only by finding new names for the old impossibilities (the Tiber or the Danube flowing backwards, instead of rivers in general, the Great Bear drinking the waters of the sea, and so forth), and those who shewed signs of restlessness under the tyranny of the *declamatio* began to abandon or parody it.

Professor Dutoit annotates freely the passages he quotes, sometimes in rather too elementary a way for the readers likely to be attracted by his essay (as on p. 102, notes on Ovid, *Amores*, i, 15). He misses one $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ in Catullus, the last line of the *Coma Berenices*, and I do not see what he means by saying (p. 105) that the words of Ulixes, *Met.* xiii, 324 *sqq.* are taken in substance from Homer. But on the whole, both his interpretations and his literary criticism are sound and good.

H. J. R.

Kapitellstudien: Beiträge zu einer Geschichte des Spätantiken Kapitells im Osten von vierten bis ins siebente Jahrhundert. By R. KAUSCH. Pp. viii + 267: 52 plates, 8 figures in the text. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1936. 64m.

The Corinthian capital has been treated by T. Homolle and E. Wiegand; also in Syria, more recently, by D. Schlumberger. The present work deals with its late varieties in the East from the fourth to the seventh centuries: therefore, obviously, with capitals that are not of the pure Roman form. The exhaustive nature of the enquiry may be judged from the number of pages in the text, and its scope from the list of 868 examples given under nineteen divisions, fifteen of which have sub-divisions which total ninety-

eight. It will be seen therefore that a considerable number of capitals may be grouped in one sub-division, amounting in one case to 43. In these circumstances it is fortunate that in the text we are not distracted by subdivisions, except as marginal notes. The whole of the material is admirably arranged, and it is most useful that the complete list indicates with precision the 341 examples which are illustrated in the plates.

The first six divisions are devoted to the most important centres—Salona, Alexandria and Cairo, Constantinople, Greece, Asia Minor, and Jerusalem; the element of place also enters into five of the later divisions—Amida, various capitals in Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Armenia, other Coptic capitals, and Rome. One would naturally expect other Italian centres (especially Ravenna) to be headed, but there are in fact several Ravennate and Dalmatian examples, as well as a sprinkling of general Italian ones, in the divisions which treat the material according to type—the fine-drilled acanthus, the sideways-diverted (wind-blown) acanthus, the two-ranged capital up to Justinian's time, the Ionic cubical ('kampfer') capital, the cubical capital, various other forms, and the barbarising of capitals after the seventh century.

Apart altogether from the interest of the book to the archaeologist and to the architectural historian dealing with late classical forms, the illustrated material is of great practical value to the architect and to the carver in stone or marble. The last mentioned could no doubt infer the material from the treatment, but it would have been an advantage if material had been mentioned in each case. The Ionic cubical capital, the ordinary cubical capital, and the wind-blown acanthus capital are well known, nor is it surprising that many of the finest examples of these come from Byzantine buildings, particularly from Santa Sophia and SS. Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople, and from the Salonica churches; but the book illustrates the beauty of the carving of lesser-known examples, such as 28. 456, with a very rich abacus (Gerasa Museum): 37, 586 (S. Sophia, Salonica): 37, 601 (Cairo, Arab Museum); 40, 663 (Constantinople Museum); 48, 837b (Cairo, Egyptian Museum); 52h (S. Giorgio in Velabro, Rome). Of the double-ranged capitals, 30. 478 and 32. 517b (Constantinople Museum) and 30. 494 (Alexandria Museum) are very fine. All of the above-mentioned examples show pure carving; this was imperilled by the facility of the drilled technique, but 24. 385 (Golden Gate, Constantinople) has

a fine and unusual building-up. There are several pilaster capitals, including one (19, 284) from that mine of fine workmanship, the Church of St. Anne at Jerusalem. The capitals with wide-spreading tops and long volute scrolls, a direct derivative from the pure Corinthian form, form an interesting group; good examples can be seen in 5, 46 (Alexandria Museum) and on Plates 7, 9, 12, etc.

As we should expect from its publishing source, the book is attractively presented and finely produced.

T. F.

L'ancien art chrétien de Syrie. By JOSEPH STRZYGOWSKI. With a preliminary essay by GABRIEL MILLET. Pp. lii + 215: 24 plates and 122 illustrations. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1936.

Strzygowski's new book is, as one might expect, not a text-book in which the student can find the Early Christian monuments of Syria neatly arranged and fully commented upon in the light of modern research. It is a synopsis of the great scholar's theories applied to one particular country and period; and his approach to this special field is as lofty and subjective as his general theories are. The book makes all the more fascinating reading as this area was among the earliest to which Strzygowski turned on his way from Rome to the East, and what was in his early period an important and productive centre of Early Christian art, all too long obscured by the dominating power which Rome commanded in the average archaeologist's mind, is now a mere thoroughfare, a gateway through which the art of Inner Asia (Mesopotamia and Iran) and the ancient North passed when launching its victorious attack on the classical art of the Mediterranean.

The vision created by Strzygowski in his later years is grandiose: an imageless abstract art produced by the genius of the Nordic races and serving as an expression of the Nordic soul is inherited by the Aryans of Iran and Mesopotamia, whence it spreads westward and conquers at least partially the Mediterranean coasts, first under the sign of the Cross and then again under Islam. Strzygowski now applies this theory to the Early Christian monuments of Syria, and one wonders whether it stands the test.

Syria, according to Strzygowski, had no creative rôle in the history of Christian art. Its coastal area was entirely under Hellenic influence, while from the hinterland Iranian traditions gradually pushed forward, following the great trade routes from Inner Asia to the

Mediterranean coast. The whole book is based on the theory that Syria in late antiquity was not more than a 'jout des puissances,' a meeting-place of two hostile traditions which are both of foreign origin and exist side by side with each other in a wholly inorganic way.

To understand this it must be borne in mind that Strzygowski has established a chronology of Syrian monuments widely differing from the current one. The most important point in his chronology is the date of the desert castle of Mshatta, which was originally attributed by him to the fourth century and which he now regards as a Parthian building of the second or third century. With this date as a basis the other conclusions follow quite naturally. For if Mshatta is contemporary with the great buildings of Palmyra, it obviously must belong to an entirely different tradition. While Palmyra shews us the power of Rome spreading eastward, we here behold ancient Iranian art entering the Mediterranean zone. It appears here in a highly developed stage, and must therefore go back to very old traditions.

Now, there are probably very few students who still believe in such an early date of Mshatta. Strzygowski fails to bring new arguments to support his theory, while many reasons in favour of a much later date have been put forward in recent years (cf. the comprehensive survey of the whole problem in Creswell's *Early Muslim Architecture*, I, 390 ff.). Strzygowski makes matters a little too easy for himself when he accuses his adversaries of a wrong 'humanistic' standpoint. The issue nowadays is no longer whether Mshatta is approached from an Oriental or an Occidental point of view, but whether the stylistic parallels found in Omayyad art hold good or not. It is difficult to believe in an early date when we see the style of which Mshatta is so striking an example gradually evolved in Syria and Egypt during the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, and when we see it so beautifully represented by several works of the Omayyad period. Precisely that continuity of development which Strzygowski *a priori* refuses to see forbids us to adopt his chronology.

For Strzygowski it is not surprising to find the style of Mshatta appearing in Syria suddenly during the second century, because according to him it had had a long and organic development in Iran. Mshatta is in fact for him simply a translation in stone of Iranian work in raw brick. Unfortunately all the Iranian buildings were made of raw brick, and have therefore disappeared. They would have been the clue to the origin of practically all the most important

features of late antique art, including 'Tiefendunkel' technique, coating of walls with stucco and mosaic, the apse, which was a holy symbol in Iran, and therefore adopted by the Christians (why, then, was it also used in the pagan architecture of Rome?), animal and vine ornament, basket-capitals, pendentives and domes over a square ground plan.

There is, of course, something very awkward in making a dead man one's main witness. How do we know that late Mesopotamian monuments like Amida were directly derived from ancient Iranian art? Why should there be an unbroken continuity of many hundred years in Iran while the most heterogeneous styles would have existed side by side with each other in the Mediterranean countries? In Syria there would be no organic development at all. Everything is here explained by foreign influences. In Inner Asia, however, all goes back to unalterable traditions from times immemorial. As far as the Mediterranean is concerned, Strzygowski still adheres to the mechanical and materialistic ideas of the late nineteenth century, while in his attitude towards oriental art there is more than a shot of twentieth century mysticism.

Syria can no longer be represented as a merely passive receptacle into which foreign influences pour with elemental directness whenever the historical circumstances are favourable. There has been both in the coastal area and in the hinterland a strong Hellenistic tradition throughout the Early Christian period, a tradition which ensured that continuity of stylistic development which Strzygowski is all too ready to deny. Oriental elements certainly played a part in this development and helped to bring about that fundamental change which we witness in Syria, as in the other countries of the Greco-Roman world at the end of the classical period. But first it must be asked to what extent these elements had already been taken up by Hellenistic and Roman artists and had been completely absorbed by the classical style long before the Christian era. Such is the case, for instance, with the arcade resting on columns (cf. Delbrueck, *Hellenistische Bauten in Latium*, p. 143 ff.), which therefore cannot be described as an Iranian mazdaistic element in the Christian architecture of Syria (Strzygowski, p. 82). Secondly, for such new oriental influence as helped to form the Early Christian art of Syria Inner Asia is probably less responsible than the local 'subantique' styles, in which ancient traditions of the Near East survived under a Hellenistic cover. The Nabataean temples, although not yet sufficiently explored, may

perhaps be regarded as an example of this subantique art of Syria; their influence on Christian architecture has been completely neglected by Strzygowski. Thirdly, even after the end of the classical period the oriental influence never completely interrupted the Hellenistic tradition, but was absorbed by it, and an entirely new style was thus evolved which cannot simply be described as Iranian brickwork translated into stone. There can therefore be no question of 'Hellas dying in the Orient's embrace.' Hellas was not dead when the Mshatta façade was carved. During the last generation students have been busy sifting the classical and oriental elements in this and many other of the great monuments of Syria. It is not a question of standpoint: it is a question of careful and detailed analysis as against hasty general judgments.

A great deal of work has been done in recent years. This book was written ten years ago, and it makes one realize how immensely our material has been enriched during that period. Neither the synagogue and church of Dura nor the newly discovered mosaics of Antioch and Palestine, neither the spectacular finds at Bethlehem nor those at Bosra and Jerash have been taken into account. But Millet is certainly right when he says in his preface that they would not have altered Strzygowski's theories. It is not surprising to find Bosra Cathedral still described as a domed church. Crowfoot's excavation report was, after all, not published until 1937. But when one finds Mar Jakob in Nisibis still quoted as a fourth-century example of a dome over a square groundplan, although as early as 1920 Sarre and Herzfeld have conclusively shown that this building had originally been covered with a flat roof, one agrees that new discoveries make indeed little difference to Strzygowski.

This book must be taken as it was intended by its French editor, who in undertaking the difficult task of translation and in writing as an introduction a most lucid and objective analysis of Strzygowski's general theories showed himself to be a colleague of rare and self-denying chivalry. It was intended by him as an 'homage' to the great Austrian scholar who, although he remained a prisoner of his general ideas, has the merit of having opened up the tracks on which practically all the work now done by students of Early Christian art proceeds.

E. K.

Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire, 867-1185. By J. M. HUSSEY. Pp. xiv + 257; 3 maps. Oxford University

Press: London, Humphrey Milford, 1937. 12s. 6d.

The Byzantine synthesis probably reached its most perfect form under the Macedonian and Comnenian Emperors. Miss Hussey has therefore done useful work in publishing this careful and well-considered study of Byzantine learning and religious life during this period. Her book contains, after a brief historical introduction, chapters on learning from 867 up to the reopening of the University of Constantinople in 1045, studies of the philosophy of Psellus and of John Italus and other Comnenian heretics, and an account of Comnenian scholarship: she then describes the ecclesiastical organisation of the period, the individual patriarchs and the monastic life, and closes with an interesting study of the eleventh-century mystic, Symeon the Young.

Miss Hussey has made a thorough examination of her material, including that formidable branch of literature, Byzantine sermons. She does full justice to certain Byzantine poets, such as John Geometres. She might perhaps have made more use of letters, which she dismisses as being too largely political. Her judgment is sensible and cautious; she quotes with approval M. Gregoire's warning that we should not exaggerate the fluctuations in Byzantine learning, and her evidence supports this view. She keeps the reopening of the University in its proper perspective. Her account of Psellus's philosophy is clear and useful, and she appends a translation of his treatise on Plato's Ideas, well annotated. She does not, however, though she mentions it, give any account of the interesting and significant demonology of the time. Her caution is sometimes excessive. She will seldom commit herself on disputed points, such as the problem of the closing of the University in c. 1054; and the whole book tends therefore to be a reliable compendium of other historians' views rather than a piece of stimulating original research. For instance, there remains more to be said about John Italus before his case can be considered closed. The extraordinary resentment against him cannot be explained by vague talk of the hostility of a religious Court to Philosophy. There must have been other causes, perhaps political, perhaps due to the somewhat 'Fascist' tendencies of the Comneni. But it is disappointing that Miss Hussey, with all her knowledge, does not help us to solve the problem.

The chapters on learning are the best. Indeed, it is to be regretted that she did not include chapters on Byzantine learning under

Theophilus and Michael III, the period in which the roots of Macedonian learning are to be found, instead of her chapters on ecclesiastical organisation, which are somewhat perfunctory. She admits her inability to discuss the obscure but important question of the episcopal organisation. In her account of the great offices of the Church, she omits to mention the most important office after the Patriarchate—namely that of *syncellus*, whose function it is essential to study when dealing with the relations between Emperor and Patriarch. Moreover, she seems to be uncertain in her opinion about those relations. At the beginning of her book she talks of the ‘dual autocracy of Basileus and Patriarch’ (p. 13): but in her account of the various Patriarchs she sees ‘how firmly the Church was under the control of the Emperor’ (p. 156). She is, however, curiously unwilling to face the fact that constitutionally and politically the Patriarch was the servant of the Emperor. Such authority as he had was moral, and was effective only when the Emperor had outraged the moral sense of the Empire. With regard to the part played by the Patriarch in crowning the Emperor she is definitely misleading. The co-operation of the Patriarch in the ceremony was certainly usual but not essential; the usurper Nicephorus Bryennius crowned himself; the last of the Byzantine Emperors, Constantine XI, was crowned by a layman. When an Emperor co-opted a colleague, as often happened, he performed the actual coronation himself, though the Patriarch handed him the crown. ‘You received the crown from God by my hand,’ said Basil I to his son, Leo VI. It is true, as Miss Hussey says, that the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus crowned Romanus I: but she should have added Cedrenus’s words, that he was acting ἐπιτροπή τοῦ βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου. John II Comnenus certainly crowned his sons himself.

The chapters on Monastic life are adequate: but the final chapter, on the mystic, Symeon the Young, shews real insight and understanding of a badly neglected side of Byzantine spiritual life, and is a valuable contribution.

Miss Hussey’s style is apt to be trite and charmless, and her grammar is at times clumsy and her meaning obscure (e.g., ‘The monks and woman were expelled from the city, not by a council of State and Church presided over by the Patriarch, but by the Empress.’ Does that mean that the Empress presided over the Council, or that there was no Council?). But her power of accumulating knowledge and her

obvious sympathy with her subject will make Byzantinists await eagerly her promised edition of the Canons of John of Euchaita, and will arouse the hope that she will give us a further study of Byzantine mysticism.

S. R.

Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transscripta, I: Hymnen des Sticherarium für September. By EGON WELLESZ. Pp. xlviii + 157. Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1936. 14 kr.

Professor Wellesz of Vienna has given us the transcription in staff notation of the 112 Stichera Idiomela, or Proper Hymns, for September, the first month in the calendar of the Orthodox Church. No collection of such a size has previously appeared, so that the publication of this book is an important event in musical history. A brilliant introduction dealing with the spirit of Byzantine music, the adaptation of tune to words, besides more technical matters, deserves the closest study by all musical historians and critics, whose ignorance will no longer merit the slightest excuse. Wellesz, by his own experience as a musician, is undoubtedly the best-qualified man to discuss these difficult aesthetic questions; and his acquaintance with Gregorian music enables him to quote some illuminating parallels. The transcriptions follow the rules laid down by the editorial board of the Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae. One hymn is given with the neumes in full, and several with five or six alternative versions from different MSS. From this it is clear that, while innumerable minor variations occur, yet the main lines of the melody were fixed, and remained so for several centuries. The chief source used by Wellesz is the Vienna codex Dalasseni (D.), dated 1217, which had already been published by the same firm in facsimile (*Mon. Mus. Byz.*, Vol. I). In the task of deciphering this valuable but very perplexing MS., Wellesz acknowledges the help of two of his students, Dr. M. Stöhr and Mlle. A. Papadopoulou. It is noteworthy that no chromatic passage seems to occur in the September hymns in MSS. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: so great was the difference between mediaeval Byzantine music and the Oriental schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As poetry the September hymns are of little merit, few of them rising above the most commonplace expression. If any metician still wishes to scan Byzantine hymns by feet, or by quantity, he will find here a complete refutation. The Idiomela are in rhythmical prose, conventional

phrases in the words matching the stereotyped formulae in the music. The accents are regarded (either by stress or by lengthening the note), but there is also a tendency to draw out final syllables in singing. A quaint touch is the expansion of unimportant words like μέν and δέ into long phrases. Nothing that we can say will bring home to the average reader the amount of research, special knowledge, musical understanding, and sheer hard work that have gone to the making of this book. But it is a monument of solid achievement on which the author deserves our warmest congratulation and the thanks of every honest student.

The Icons of Cyprus. By D. TALBOT RICE.

With chapters by RUPERT GUNNIS and TAMARA TALBOT RICE. (*Courtauld Institute Publications on Near Eastern Art*, 2.) Pp. 287; 51 plates. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. £3 10s.

This book, the second of a series devoted to Near Eastern Art and published by the Courtauld Institute, deals with the icons preserved in Cyprus, mostly in small and inconspicuous village churches. Most of these icons are reproduced on excellent plates, and a detailed description of them is given in the form of a catalogue. In the preface, Professor Talbot Rice emphasises the difficulties with which his task has met: and we are grateful to him and to his collaborators, Mrs. Talbot Rice and Mr. Rupert Gunnis, for carrying out the work of collecting this material and for their efforts to secure the preservation of the originals.

Professor Talbot Rice has contributed chapters on the importance of these icons for the history of art. In the first place he describes the development of later Greek icon-painting. He traces the history of three traditions which, though continually intermingling with each other, can be immediately distinguished, and differ in their lines of descent and in their typical characteristics: a Western school, fairly important in Cyprus and deriving from classical Roman art, an Eastern tradition mainly associated with Asia Minor and Syria, and the school of Constantinople which is the most important of all. From this there derive numerous local schools which are described in detail.

Hitherto our knowledge of later Byzantine art was indeed very vague. But one wonders whether the divisions and sub-divisions of schools established by Professor Talbot Rice really help to increase it, especially as he himself cannot avoid drawing our attention constantly to manifold influences and counter-influences be-

tween these different schools. He admits, *e.g.*, that the revival of the Western school which is obvious in Byzantine art from the thirteenth century onwards, was itself due to a large extent to Constantinopolitan influences; we would add that this Western tradition, during its earlier development from the seventh century onwards, and again in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, had already undergone so many and such decisive influences from the Hellenistic art of the Byzantine capital, and even from that of Syria and Asia Minor, that we can hardly expect to find the 'non-Byzantine' character of the 'paintings and mosaics of Christian Rome' reflected in it. The problem of Byzantine reactions in Italian art is in itself very complicated, and a closer study of earlier Byzantine painting should warn us not to simplify them by generalisations.

In a chapter on the schools of Cypriot painting, that curious mixture of Western and Eastern influences is described which resulted from the unique political history of the island, and which is characteristically evident in every Cypriot work. A special feature of the art of Cyprus are the portraits of donors, mostly represented after their deaths, which give to the panels the character of memorials. Apart from the predominantly Western, Eastern and Constantinopolitan groups mentioned above, Professor Talbot Rice distinguishes a Byzantino-Cypriot and a Franco-Cypriot school, which in their turn are subdivided into smaller groups, which differ as to their quality, technique and the subjects represented. A chapter on iconography describes the types of the principal subjects of Byzantine art which are found in Cyprus.

The pages dealing with the costumes of Cyprus in the Middle Ages, as well as those on textiles, embroidery, jewellery and heraldry, as found on Cypriot icons and frescoes, will be of especial interest to students of the cultural relations existing between Europe and the East in the Middle Ages. In a chapter on 'Some Aspects of Social Life in Medieval Cyprus,' Mrs. Talbot Rice points out that Byzantine civilization was the predominant basis of Cypriot life, which never completely yielded to French or Italian influence. A fascinating picture of social and commercial life results from the sources referring to the rôle which the wealthy island played in the history of the expansion of medieval Europe towards the East.

The results of this book for the history of art, however, are rather scanty. It has already been mentioned that a closer study of the earlier phases of the evolution of Byzantine art would have shown that the Greek schools of painting

which can be traced in Cypriote art are in themselves of a most complex character, and of a much more confusing and complicated origin than Professor Talbot Rice makes them out to be. His merit of having investigated a field as yet completely unexplored and not easily accessible, should be gladly acknowledged. But such an investigation should not have been carried through without due regard for those branches of Byzantine painting from which the works of art described are to be derived. Moreover, we cannot overlook the fact that this splendid publication is devoted to monuments the artistic value of which does not quite justify this magnificence. Many problems of Byzantine art which are more important than the icons of Cyprus still remain to be solved. We must hope that the author may in the near future present us with a publication of a similar impeccable get-up, but which is devoted to more generally interesting works of art. That even in Cyprus Byzantinists may be faced by problems of a much wider range is revealed by Professor Talbot Rice himself, who, with reference to the mosaic of Chiti, says that 'opinions differ as to whether this should be assigned to the sixth or to the ninth century' (p. 62, note 1)—at any rate a statement which is somewhat surprising when made by a Byzantinist writing in 1937.

H. B.

Οἱ Ἕλληνες τῆς Ἀναγεννήσεως καὶ ὁ Δομήνικος Θεοτοκόπουλος. By ACHILLES A. KYROU. Pp. 436. Athens: Demetrakos, 1938.

The editor of the *Hestia* has devoted his leisure for many years to the study of El Greco. In 1931 his former book on this famous Cretan painter won a prize from the Athenian Academy; since then he has made further studies in Crete, Venice, Rome, Paris, Spain and among the documents of Sinai and Zante, the result of which is the present handsome volume, illustrated with 32 pictures. He shews that a branch of the family of Theotokes, of which the more eminent was transplanted to Corfu, emigrated from Constantinople to Crete after 1453, and its descendants are still found at Fodele near Candia, where a quarter is called Theotokiana, while a 'Sir Theotochi' is mentioned in a Veneto-Cretan document of 1512, and another occurs in one of 1583. There Theotokopoulos was born in 1541, the termination of his name being then common in Crete. He was probably educated at the school of the monastery of St. Catherine at Candia, an offshoot of that of Sinai; hence the painter's pictures of St. Catherine and Sinai,

which was closely connected with Crete, especially then, but after the Turkish conquest of the island from Venice the monks of Candia fled to the then Venetian island of Zante. The painter's life in Venice, where he arrived about 1560 and was a pupil of Titian, Rome and Spain, where most of his life was spent and where he died in 1614, is described, and to his close association with the Greek colony at Venice is ascribed his preservation of Byzantine ideas. Its centre was the church of St. George, consecrated during his stay. There he painted the convent of Sinai—a picture preserved in Hungary, of which the book contains a photograph. In Rome he lived in the Palazzo Farnese, where he met Fulvio Orsini, the 'humanist,' but, according to one account, was forced to leave for Spain owing to his arrogant remark that, if Michael Angelo's 'Last Judgment' were destroyed, he would be capable of painting it afresh. About his long sojourn in Spain there is only one chapter, because the author admits that he has nothing new to add to what he in his previous book and various Spanish authors have written about the 'Byzantine painter of Toledo.'

The biography is preceded by two long introductory chapters on 'The Greek contribution to the Renaissance' and 'Byzantine Art and the Cretan School.' The former treats of 'the Greek intellectuals in Italy from the time of Petrarch to that of El Greco'—a subject about which, and especially about Bessarion, much had been written. The latter, also a well-cultivated field, explains 'the Byzantine descent of Theotokopoulos,' whom Barrès called the 'Enigma of Toledo.' No one is better qualified than M. Kyrou to solve this 'enigma'; Englishmen, like Rutter and Robert Byron, have explained it; but by race and traditions a Greek, sprung like Theotokopoulos from another great island, Cyprus, was obviously marked out to expound El Greco to his countrymen. The clear style is what we should expect from the editor of the most literary Greek journal.

W. M.

Rhigas Velestinlis : La Révolution française et les préludes de l'Indépendance hellénique. By AP. DASCALAKIS. Pp. 231. Paris, 1937.

Les oeuvres de Rhigas Velestinlis. By AP. DASCALAKIS. Pp. 125. Paris, 1937.

Much has been written about Rhigas Pheraios, as he is pedantically called from the ancient name of Velestino, although the classical

adjective is not found in his writings. Upon the documents published by Amantos and Theotokes, the Serbian monograph by Pantelich, and numerous other works, supplemented by researches in the archives of the French Foreign Office, which, however, almost ignore Rhigas, the author has traced this account of the influence of the French Revolution on Greece and the life and death of Rhigas, the precursor of the War of Greek Independence. He thinks that the execution of Mavrogenes, Prince of Wallachia, whose secretary Rhigas was, first influenced him against Turkish tyranny, while his relations with France, though there is no evidence of his alleged interview with Napoleon, dated from his tenure of the post of interpreter at the French consulate at Bucharest. His literary works, except the trivial first, are shewn to have been inspired by one idea: the Greek revival; that is their sole importance, and he wrote in the 'vulgar' language so as to be understood of the people, whose character he thoroughly comprehended. His 'constitution', as Tsatsos has proved, was not original but largely a translation from the French revolutionary documents. In his plans for the liberation of the Greeks he counted on the aid of the ambitious Pasvanoglu, and preached Balkan collaboration 132 years before the first Balkan Conference met at Athens in 1930, when the delegates laid wreaths on his statue and the Viennese named a street after him, as Belgrade had done in 1877. A chapter contains the 'diplomatic bargain' between Austria and Turkey, by which Rhigas was surrendered in exchange for the Polish refugees and economic advantages. After he had been strangled in the Neboysha tower at Belgrade, of which there is an excellent photograph, and which still stands, both Austrians and Turks propagated to whitewash themselves the rumour that he had escaped. The preface by Philippe Sagnac contains an anachronism: Bonaparte had not 'delivered the Seven Islands from the yoke of the Turks' while Rhigas was at Vienna: the second French occupation of the Ionian Islands began nine years after his death. There was no 'Archbishop' of Bristol—as his neighbour in the hotel at Trieste, who tried to save him, is called. Slovenes and Dalmatians are not 'Orthodox.' The bibliography contains useful critical notes: but Finlay and the present reviewer are cited in old editions. There are thirteen illustrations.

The second volume consists of a 'bibliographical study' of Rhigas' translations, including that of Metasio's *Olympie*, with which

the Athenian theatre opened in 1836, of his maps, of his 'probably authentic' and un-authentic works, the latter comprising his 'political testament,' found in Capo d'Istria's archives and published by Theotokes in 1931, which is here ascribed to 1828. The so-called 'Revolutionary proclamation,' supposed to have been lost, is identical with the existing introduction to the Constitution. Of these and of the *Thourios* he publishes the text with a French translation, the last-named being reprinted from the Corfù copy published there in 1798 with variants from Fauriel and others.

W. M.

Ἡ θρυλικὴ ζωὴ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Βουρβάκη. By G. PHTERES. Pp. 173. Athens: "Kastalia."

The Cephalonians, as Andreades once said, 'are the Yorkshiremen of Greece'; a Cephalonian is at present Prime Minister. But none had a stranger career than those of the French general, Bourbaki and his ancestors. His grandfather, a Cephalonian ship-owner, escaping Nelson's vigilance, brought to Bonaparte, then in Egypt, the message recalling him to Paris in 1799, in return for which service Napoleon made him a French citizen, and appointed one of his sons French Consul at Cephalonian in 1805, while the other entered the French army. The latter served with Joseph Bonaparte in Spain, married a Spaniard and went as emissary to Napoleon at Elba to bid him return. After Waterloo, where he was present, he settled at Po, where the hero of this biography was born in 1816, but he came to Greece in 1826, organised a band of Ionian volunteers, but was killed at the battle of Menidi. According to one account the Turkish commander cut off his head and sent it as a trophy to the Sultan, who made a cup of his skull. His son served many years in Algiers, was aide-de-camp to Louis Philippe, fought in the Crimean, Italian and Franco-Prussian campaigns, met the Empress Eugénie at Chislehurst, served under the Third Republic and died in 1897. The book is agreeably written in the 'vulgar' language and has a bibliography and a preface by Marshal Franchet d'Esperey, who commanded in Macedonia in 1918.

It has since been shewn that the Bourbakis were a branch of the Byzantine family of Skordilai, which emigrated to Crete after its conquest from the Arabs by Nikephoros Phokas in 961, and thence to Cephalonian.

W. M.

Χρονικά τοῦ 'Ο.Λ.Π.' 'Ο Λιμὴν τοῦ Πειραιῶς.

By THE ORGANISATION OF THE HARBOUR OF THE PIRAEUS. Pp. 283. 1937.

No Greek city has grown so extraordinarily during the last century as the Piraeus, which had 12 inhabitants in 1827 and 251,639 at the last census of 1928, probably increased to 350,000 to-day. This official account of what is now the third most important harbour of the Mediterranean consists of four parts: historical, descriptive, administrative and legal. After a brief sketch of its history from its foundation by Themistokles to its destruction by Sulla and an allusion to its Frankish name of Porto Leone, found on the monument, now in the English Church, to the two British captains who died there in 1685, the narrative describes the reconstruction of the harbour works by a decree of 1836, which imposed a tithe on all imports for building a jetty and draining the marshes. The removal of the capital from Nauplia to Athens naturally developed the Piraeus, where Chiotes and Hydriotes settled; the opening of the railway uniting the capital with its port in 1869 further assisted it; the present organisation was created in 1930 and, to the great relief of passengers, no longer forced to battle with boatmen, steamers were anchored alongside the quays. Finally a law of 1932 established a free zone on the analogy of the 'Serbian zone' at Salonika, which is shewn to have been derived from the classical precedent of the Phokaeon zone at Marseilles and the Byzantine concessions to Venetians, Genoese and Amalfitans. Since the removal of the Turkish capital to Angora, the Piraeus has gained at the expense of Constantinople. Since Hastings, whose heart rests in the English church, brought the first steamer into the Piraeus in 1827, there has been a great advance, for in 1927 there entered it 8,195 steamers. The volume contains a bibliography, numerous illustrations and four maps.

W. M.

Διαλέξεις περὶ τῶν κορυφαίων Κυπρίων Φιλοσόφων καὶ Πεζογράφων. Issued by the Committee of the 'Kinyrias' society. Pp. 148. 4 page illustrations and 6 portraits. Paphos, 1937. 50 dr.

This book consists of a series of seven lectures, delivered by members of the Society. K. Spyridakis and K. Georgiadis deal respectively with the philosophies of Zeno of Kiton and Demonax (time of Hadrian), pleasantly enough, but without, as far as can be judged, adding anything of importance to our knowledge.

T. Anthias and S. Christis describe the work of two contemporary Cypriote writers—the first-named that of Nikos Nikolaidis, and the second that of Melis Nikolaidis. The work of these two authors consists mainly of short articles and stories, and, however meritorious, hardly calls for discussion in this *Journal*. It is worth remarking, however, that Cypriote men of letters seem to be forced to migrate to Athens, if they are to have any hope of success.

Loizos Philippou writes interestingly on Leontios Machairas. As is natural, his article is largely based on the monumental edition of Prof. Dawkins, but he gives a good sketch of social conditions in Cyprus at the period of Machairas, and has opinions of his own about the historian's date. He places his birth between 1350 and 1360, some twenty years earlier than the date conjectured by Prof. Dawkins. He does not hesitate to identify the Τιμαν, given in the Bodleian MS. as its place of writing, with Κτήμα. The same author has an article on the Archimandrite Kyprianos, who is an example of the improved intellectual culture of Cyprus in the eighteenth century, though his literary work was done mainly in Italy. He devoted much attention to Aristotle, but his most important book is the *Chronological History of Cyprus*, published at Venice in 1788. This work is a valuable source of information for the history of Cyprus under the Turks.

Another interesting study is that of P. Paschalidis on S. Neophytos, who lived in the twelfth century. His career was amazing. At first merely a cave-dwelling ascetic, he gradually built up a noted monastery which survives to the present day in the neighbourhood of Paphos. The great Church of the monastery was founded after his death, probably, as a recently discovered inscription indicates, by Michael VIII. Palaeologus. Though a man of little education, he shewed an extraordinary literary activity. His writings include exegetic treatises on the Bible, lives of Saints (wherein are found bitter strictures on the depredations of Saladin), and a *Τυπική Διαθήκη*, giving the circumstances of the foundation of the monastery, rules for its government, and other information as to his career. Another work of 1196 is a severe censure of the miseries inflicted upon Cyprus by Isaac Comnenos and Richard Coeur de Lion, and mentions the sale of the island by the latter. Neophytos was also an ardent builder and a painter of merit.

These lectures are a welcome proof of intellectual activity in Cyprus.

F. H. M.




THE MOUND AND THE SHEIKH'S TOMB.




PAVED ROOM OF LEVEL II (J 7)

AL MINA, SUEIDIA




DRAIN AND PIT IN LEVEL II




MUD BRICK WALL OF LEVEL III.


AL MINA SUEIDIA.



STONE SARCOPHAGUS OF LEVEL IV



BRONZE DOOR FITTINGS, LEVEL III
AL MINA, SUEIDIA.



BIN CONTAINING LEKYTHI, LEVEL III




ROOM FILLED WITH POINTED JARS, LEVEL III




1 AND 2, BRITISH MUSEUM, 3, BERLIN 4 AND 5, WURZBURG

PLASTIC VASES.



IG II.² 1370 1371 1384, THE HEKATOMPEDON-RECORD OF 4032 B.C., FRONT AND BACK.



IG ii.² 1386 | 1381, THE HEKATOMPEDON RECORD
OF 401/0 B.C.



IG ii.² 1372 | 1402, THE HEKATOMPEDON RECORD
OF 402/1 B.C.



2



1



3




4



1



2



3



4

THE EXCAVATIONS AT AL MINA, SUEIDIA. II

[PLATES X-XV.]

IN the first part of this report ¹ I dealt with the broad results of the excavations on the Greek harbour site; this, the second part, is intended to give the detail upon which those results were based. Again, it is archaeological only in the narrowest sense of the word; the pottery which forms the bulk of our historical material will be described hereafter by others, and is mentioned here only so far as it may throw light upon the use and character of the rooms; most of the other objects found figure only in the catalogue, and the description is of the buildings alone. Even so it is partial. To have given a detailed account of all the hundreds of rooms excavated and noted would have been at once wearisome and otiose. Much of the material recorded in the field notes was intended merely to establish relative dates and levels and is utilised in the plans so that its repetition in the text would have been useless. I have accordingly selected what appeared to me to be of interest as illustrating the condition in which the remains were found or witnessing to their original character, as summarised in the first part of the report, and have suppressed whatever was redundant. To the description of the buildings of each period is added a catalogue of the principal miscellaneous objects found in that level; but, at the risk of inconsistency, I have put together in a separate list certain classes of objects, seals, amulets, etc., which seemed to gain interest by such grouping; and the weights, which require special treatment, have been omitted altogether.

SECTION I. THE HOUSES.

LEVEL 2.

Much destroyed by the plough. In *House A*, the best preserved, the wall-foundations were only 1.00 m. below the modern surface; in this house most of the floors were preserved, but elsewhere they had gone, and it was difficult to associate objects with the rooms, many of those found between the walls belonging really to Level 3.

Sq. H 6: A cobbled surface had been laid in the lane over the stone cover-slabs of the Level 3 drain; no continuation of the drain found in Sq. G 7. The recess in the wall of *House A* (behind room 12) was paved with tiles 0.22 m. sq.; its walls were built partly of similar tiles and partly of limestone set in cement mortar; in the back of the recess, 0.40 m. above the pavement, was a window 0.55 m. wide, its S.E. jamb of tiles, its N.W. jamb of limestone ashlar (Pl. I). *House A* shewed few signs of modification and was all more or less of a period. Room 1 was an open court with an annexe (?) in the north corner, beyond which was the front door leading to the street,

¹ Pp. 1-30 of the present volume of the *JHS*, to which plate and figure references are made.
JHS—VOL. LVIII.

its jambs of ashlar masonry; the S.E. wall also was faced with quarry-dressed blocks, and along its foot ran an open drain built of channelled limestone blocks, the intake at the S.W. end, a cup-shaped hollow, implying that there had been here a vertical stack-pipe bringing the drainage from the roof while the outlet at the street end, now broken away, may well have communicated with the sump-pit to the S.E. The N.E. wall of the house appears unduly thick, but was probably less thick than it appears; the outer face was preserved only at the northern end, from the front door to where a terra-cotta drain ran through the wall from room 2 and emptied into a stone-lined sump-pit 1.30 m. deep, diam. 1.35 m. The drain was vertical, of pipes 0.40 m. long, diam. 0.175 m. tapered to 0.15 m., with handles; at the base was an elbow joint (Pl. II and Fig. 13), continued by a pipe overlapping the pit. Another vertical drain occupied a recess in the wall-face close to the front door. The back of the wall was found only in room 7, and the short length of stonework there may have been a bench against the wall. This had long been the street frontage, and the evidence for the several periods was much confused; against the exit of the court trough-drain the rubble foundations of Level 2 went down for 0.60 m. below the drain, then came a layer of rubbish containing much burnt grain, 0.20 m. thick, then fresh rubble foundations (Level 3) for 0.30 m., which rested on the mud-brick wall of Level 4, whose stone foundations, a metre lower down, had, like those of Level 3, been cut through by the sump-pit, whereas the wall of Level 2 was carried across the gap so made. There had been re-building in Level 2, and so little of the stonework of either phase survived that the nature of the wall must remain doubtful, but probably room 5 (and room 7) extended further towards the N.E. than is shewn on the plan.

Room 2 was almost completely ruined; it had had a cement floor. Room 3 had also had a cement floor: its ground-plan was doubtful, the N.W. wall shewn in the plan being perhaps only the side of a continuation of the drain running under the street to the S.W., the other side of the drain being the foundation of the room-wall proper; there was very little stone work left. Room 4 was cement-floored. Room 5 was much destroyed but in it and in room 6 the N.W. exterior wall was faced above floor level with large quarry-dressed limestone blocks, as was the wall dividing Room 6 from rooms 7, 8 and 9: in it were amphorae of type 4. Room 6 was cement-floored; a single ashlar jamb as wide as the wall thickness shewed the existence of a door in the S.W. wall, of which the corresponding jamb had disappeared. Rooms 7, 8 and 9 were all cement-floored, and the walls dividing them were built on the top of the floors, and were therefore secondary to the main Level 2 period.

In room 8 was much charred wood, and with it crushed fragments of large circular bronze vessels, apparently trays or platters. In room 13 was found the fine local column krater, MN. 133 (Fig. 10); it was let upright into the floor, covered with a very large broken flat dish of Attic black ware, and was empty, except for infiltrated earth. It may have belonged to Level 3. In room 15 was found an alabaster jar, MN. 77, Fig. 19. Built into the N.W. wall of room 6 was a block of limestone on

which part of a volute design was rather roughly carved, Fig. 14; it must have belonged to an earlier level and was here re-used. In room 9 was the Hellenistic marble head, MN. 3 (Fig. 12, p. 27).

House B had undergone repairs and minor alterations on at least two occasions, but owing to the ruined condition of its walls it was not possible to differentiate between the phases very clearly; no cement floors survived; the walls were poorly built. Above the ruins was found a small fragment of an inscribed marble slab, MN. 59.

The date of the two buildings (which were founded at the same time over the burnt remains of Level 3) was given by the discovery immediately below the unbroken cement floor of room 4, House A, of the fragments of the fine Kerch style red-figured vase MNP. 91; the transition from Level 3 to Level 2, therefore, came at about 375 B.C.

House C. Only part was excavated, and that was badly ruined. In room C 2 there remained one jamb of the entrance-door; the stone foundations were continued across the passage and in this threshold-foundation was preserved the slot for the timber of the door-frame. The wall dividing the two small rooms C 3 and C 4 was later than the rest.



FIG. 13.—DRAIN PIPES ($\frac{1}{2}$).

FIG. 14.—CARVED LIMESTONE FRAGMENT ($\frac{1}{2}$).

House D seems to have been separated from House A by a lane, but the destruction of the walls on either side of it made its exact line uncertain. It looked as if the N.W. wall of House A had been brought forward so as to enclose the old Level 3 street, the upper part of the old drain being now inside the house, while to make a new street a strip had been cut off from the House D site; but, as the ground-plan shews, the evidence for this is unsatisfactory.

The house, occupying a whole block, was much ruined. No proper entrance was found (the entrance to room D 1 is too narrow to be the main door), and it was probably in the S.E. wall, room D 3 being an open court, while rooms D 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10 may have been shops not communicating with the rest of the building. The very small hollow block of masonry, D 2, was perhaps a cupboard.

House E. Very little of it remained, most having been swept away by the river; what is left served perhaps as an oil-shop, for in a raised block of mud and stone, a sort of counter, there were large clay vessels let into the masonry with cylindrical drain-pipes beside them, and against the street wall was a second raised base covered with flat tiles, 0.63 m. \times 0.55 m. sq., having raised edges, from which a set of drain-pipes led out, 0.43 m. long,

with handles (cf. Fig. 13), through the thickness of the wall, and there was also a round terra-cotta bin let into the clay floor.

House F was too badly ruined for its ground-plan to be made out with any degree of completeness; there were no floors; only the foundation of the walls remained, and the emplacement of doorways could seldom be fixed. There had been a good deal of alteration during the lifetime of the building and there were a number of large impost-stones which had in some cases, *e.g.*, between rooms 7 and 8, been incorporated in later walls. Signs of reconstruction were clear in room 6, where the remains of a wall, with a door-jamb, paralleled that in room 8; also in Sq. C 6 the two walls at the S.W. end of room 13 could not be contemporary. In the outer of the two walls last mentioned there was a flight of stone steps which seems to have led up to a raised floor which has now disappeared; the steps originally belonged to a late phase of Level 3 (*q.v.*), but were re-used in Level 4. Let into the clay floor of room F 14 was a very large store-jar with loop handles and small rings for attaching a lid (Fig. 27, 20). In room F 17 there was a pot drain in the floor; in room F 19, at the east corner, there was a horizontal drain formed of a series of terra-cotta pipes which emptied into the street and must have connected with the stone conduit running along that street, though the connection is now missing. Just beyond the south corner of the room there was found, built into the stone foundations of the S.E. wall continued, a limestone head of a bearded man of conventional Cypriote type, MN. 387. Lying across the foundations of the S.W. wall of House D there was a fragment of a limestone column-shaft; it had no connection with the building, nor was any building of the period found to which it might have belonged; it lay fairly close to the surface and was perhaps of Byzantine date, resembling columns found in Level 1 in Sqq. K-M 5-8. In Sq. D 6 there was found the mercury mentioned in my previous report (p. 24); it may have belonged to this level or to Level 3.

LEVEL 3.

The streets were originally pebble-surfaced, but of the surface little as a rule remained; in the long street running from Sq. J 4 to Sq. F 9 most of the street's width was paved with the cover-stones of the drains. Judging by their level, the drains had been constructed after the houses were built, but during their lifetime; most of them were re-used in Level 2. The short section of drain in Sqq. J 4, J 5 was shallow and poorly made, with rough cover-stones; its slope was down to the N.E. and it emptied into the big drain running N.W. between houses B and C. The latter was excellently made, the sides being of thin limestone slabs as much as 0.80 m. sq. set on edge, the bottom of it cemented, the cover-stones large and well fitting. Into it also emptied the drain running between houses A (on the S.E.) and B and E; this was not so well constructed, but a certain amount of cement was used in it; it was built of rough limestone slabs and was 0.30 m. wide and 0.25 m. deep. It is possible that the drain was continued along the N.E. front of House A; either the house wall had been reconstructed (and there was evidence of reconstruction elsewhere) or what looked like



an earlier wall-face at a slightly lower level and at a slightly different angle was the side of a drain of which the other (N.E.) side had disappeared down the river bank. Otherwise there was no drain along this N.W. \times S.E. street; in the next branch street to the north (Sqq. E 7 to G 4) the drain begins at the street junction between houses E and G, and again slopes down to the S.W.²

House A. Room 2. On the clay floor stood a rectangular basalt basin, MN. 21, decorated in the Syro-Hittite style with crudely executed bulls' heads at the corners, but at the ends with a stepped design of Phoenician type; it measures 0.32 m. \times 0.19 m. By it was a rubbing-stone of natural pebble, a plain steatite spindle-whorl, a clay vase-stand (Fig. 28, 22), ht. 0.14 m., and an iron dagger-blade, MN. 28, 0.36 m. long (fragmentary). Room 5 had a clay floor (like all the rooms in this level; there were no cement floors) on which were the fragments of twenty or more clay amphorae of types 6 and 10; they were standing leaned against the N.W. and S.W. walls. Room 6 was almost full of large amphorae of types 3 and 16; with them, a small lekythos of type L 1, some large bronze nails and a bronze needle. Room 7 was filled with clay vessels, mostly tall-handled amphorae of type 13 (see Pl. IV); some smaller amphorae of type 3; also fragments of a bowl of local ware with horizontal loop handles of red clay with bands of dark paint round the inside. Room 8: In the middle of the floor a handled disk of bronze; towards the S. corner remains of the bowl of a bronze phiale with a bronze tube which may have been its handle; in the south corner 3 store-jars. In the S.W. annexe, against the door-jamb, a mass of sheet copper, shapeless. Room 10: Sunk for half its height in the floor, in the centre of the room, was a clay amphora of type 3.

Rooms 11 and 12 contained numerous amphorae of type 3. Room 13 had at its S.W. end many amphorae of type 10, and at the N.E. end, and especially in the east corner, nests of small lekythi of type L 1. The walls of the room were better preserved than most, the foundations of the walls of Level 2 being about a metre above the Level 3 floor, so that some of the mud brick remained above the rubble foundation-courses; they had been smoothly mud-plastered and whitewashed. The floor was thickly covered with wood ash. Room 14: There was here distinct proof of the partial rebuilding of Level 3 prior to its destruction by fire; in the N.W. wall the original construction in mud brick over pebble foundations had been cut down to *ca.* 0.60 m. height, and along it had been laid rough rubble foundations with mud brick above, of which only traces remained; over the latter, overhanging it, came the heavy stone foundations of Level 2. Similar signs, though less distinct, could be seen in the S.E. wall of the room. The mud-bricks of the first phase measure 0.40 m. \times 0.30 m. (?) \times 0.14 m.; those of the second phase, as given by remains in room 15 (S.E. wall), measure 0.44 m. \times 0.22 m. \times 0.11 m. In the room were many large amphorae, too fragmentary to type; fragments of local painted ware,

² The fact is evidence of the wide extension of the original town towards the N.E., where the *tell* has been swept away by the river. The quarters near the river bank would certainly have been drained


into the harbour, *i.e.*, the drains would have sloped down to the N.E.: only on the S.W. outskirts of the town is the drainage likely to have carried off to the low ground.

FIG. 15.—TYPES OF LAMPS ($\frac{1}{3}$).

MN. 255

MN. 264

FIG. 16.—BRONZE FITTINGS FOR FURNITURE.




MN. 397



MN. 391



MN. 244



MN. 26

FIG. 18.—BRONZE VESSELS.




FIG. 17.—TYPES OF FIBULAE.

floral design, and two late black-figured Attic lekythi with ivy pattern. A small hoard of the little 'barrel' lekythi of type L 1 with bands of red paint, lay at a higher level than the other pottery, and belonged to the second phase of the building, whereas the rest must have belonged to the first. The lekythi (see Pl. IV) lay in a single layer, touching each other, in a shallow clay bin, the sides and bottom of which, like the vases themselves, were discoloured by heat; it gave the appearance of a furnace, but was certainly a storage-bin for oil-pots, and the discoloration was due to the burning of the oil. Room 15: In the ruins of the N.W. (mud-brick) wall was found an iron adze, MN. 329. The re-building here was obvious; the walls of the second phase, of mud-brick, were well preserved, as was the clay floor connected with them, both heavily burned. In the room were quantities of burned grain, apparently a small-grained wheat, on the top of which was a sherd of a black-figured kotyle, certainly not in its right setting. On the floor, arranged along the N.E. and N.W. walls, were a number of metal objects perhaps belonging to a couch (?), and others probably from a door. Against the N.W. wall were 22 large bronze nails, all bent at right angles, l. 0.19 m., forming more or less a double row, two knob handles, two pole-ends, all of bronze, and fragments of an iron lock (Pl. III); against the N.E. wall were more large nails, two pole-ends of bronze and between them a bronze ring, two bronze bobbin-like fittings and 3 small plates of iron; the 'pole-ends' in this case had side slots as if to take a right-angled frame. With these were bronze fittings for furniture, MN. 255, 264, Fig. 16. Room 19 contained a number of Attic lamps of plain black glaze ware, of the ribbon-handled type (Fig. 15); a copper sauce-pan lid (?), an iron dagger-blade and a quantity of sherds of large lekythi of local fabric (*v.* Fig. 28, L 5) with rough decoration of lines and waved bands or leaf ornament in black or brown paint.

Room 21 had a door opening on the street. Room 22 contained large amphorae of type 13, and against its S.W. wall, in a bed of ashes, was a quantity of burnt grain and with it a set of glazed beads (the colours much bleached), balls and cylinders and eye-beads. In room 24 was the stone coffin grave MNN. 9. Room 25 had door-jambs of quarry-dressed limestone. Room 31 contained a few large amphorae, some large lekythi of local ware with decoration consisting of bands of red paint and one band of festoon design (type L 5, *v.* Fig. 28) and a great many small lekythi of type L 1; the last were again in a circular mud bin and, like the bin, had been heavily burned. The bin belonged to the second phase of the building and was 0.50 m. above the original floor of the room, on which again was much broken pottery, including many fragments of small lekythi exactly like those in the bin.

House B. The whole of the S.E. part of the building was destroyed and nothing of the plan could be made out. It would seem that the entrance was by a turning out of the street to the N.W. which led into a central court (room B 6); this arrangement is suggested in the reconstruction given in my previous report, Figs. 3 and 4. According to this the building would have been of the standard design, modified only as regards its approach.

In room 1 here was against the S.E. wall a row of large jars of different

sorts, types 5 and 8, and part of a big flat dish, diam. *ca.* 0.35 m. To the S.W. of room 10 there was a patch of cement floor about 3.20 m. across. The stone grave, MNN. 12, apparently belonged to this building. Scattered over rooms B 7, 8 and 10 were numerous fragments of Attic r.f. kraters, including parts of a finely painted example with a scene of sacrifice before an altar piled with wood.

House C. Only two rooms were cleared. Room 1 had been much destroyed by 3 rubbish-pits of later date and by a late wall; in it were numerous amphorae of types 1 and 4. Through the S.E. wall ran a terracotta pipe drain connecting with the street conduit.

House E. This is the best preserved of the buildings of this level and illustrates the standard type of warehouse; *v.* the reconstruction in Fig. 3 of my previous article. The rubble foundation against the N.E. wall of room 1, which impinges on the street, may have been a bench or counter for a shop, or perhaps supported the lead from a vertical pipe to the head of the underground drain running down the street to the N.W. In room 1 there was against the N.E. wall a stone impost which has a curious parallel in room 14 of House A, Level 4. Room 2 contained the fine necklace of gold and silver beads (MN. 344) illustrated in Fig. 9, p. 25; with it was a silver fibula attached to a silver chain, MN. 345, and a number of silver coins and two lead ingots; the room may well have been a silversmith's shop. The coins date the building to the first quarter of the fourth century.

In room 6 there were found 43 clay lamps; they were of different types, the ribbon-handled form, type 2, Fig. 15, in black Attic ware; the simple ledge-handled type 3, usually of red haematitic ware, but sometimes of plain clay, and examples of the local 'cocked-hat' lamp in rough pottery, type 1; with them was one 'cocked-hat' lamp in bronze, MN. 237. In room 7 near the south corner was a group of about 40 Attic gutti or lamp-fillers, black with fluted bodies, and towards the N.E. end the room was full of nuts. Room 13 was unusual in having a floor of mud bricks. In room 14 (which was very much ruined) there were found 3 examples of the small lekythos type L 4, others of type L 5, and fragments of a large late r.f. krater; these lay in a burnt layer below the foundations of the little stone-built compartment of Level 2 and should therefore belong to Level 3. In the south corner of the courtyard there was a big and wide-mouthed amphora buried with its rim flush with the court floor.

House F. Only the part of the building fronting on the main street was preserved, and that only towards the N.W. end of the block; the back had all been swept away by the river, and the walls ended abruptly at the edge of the old bank. To the S.E. of room 1, where there were no walls left, part of the floor survived, and on this was a roughly circular clay bin filled with hundreds of small local lekythi; both bin and vessels had been heavily burned by the firing of the contents of the latter. By the side of the bin there lay a collection of 8 bronze weights of assorted sizes, MN. 23. The floor was of clay over a pebble bedding. Room 1: Half of the floor was of clay, but at the S.E. end half of the space was taken up by a shallow rectangular bin wherein were stacked hundreds of small local lekythi and a fair number of the larger sort with painted bands and festoon design. In

the south corner and against the S.E. wall were two large limestone ashlar blocks, and the floor between and in front of them, up to the edge of the bin, was of cobbles; the blocks perhaps supported a wooden table-top. In the N.W. part of the room there was a low circular base of rubble masonry and a square stone support. In room 3 there was a circular oven (?)—base and, against the N.E. wall, a rectangular platform of rubble masonry. Room 6 was filled with small Attic aryballi (v. Fig. 8, p. 23). Rooms 7 and 8 shewed evidence of re-building or structural alterations during the period of Level 3, the mud-brick wall at their S.W. ends being earlier




FIG. 19.—ALABASTER VASE TYPES.

in date than the wall dividing them and than the rubble wall which runs parallel to it and forms the N.E. limit of room 6. Here, 0.40 m. below the bottom of the foundations of the Level 2 wall (House E, room E 1) and above the floor of Level 3, there were found fragments of the big bell krater in the Kerch style MNP. 91.³ The aryballi lay 0.30 m. lower down, in a stratum of ashes which ran up against the wall of room 6. In room 7 there was found a vase of plain drab clay, type L 3, ht. 0.15 m., containing a hoard

³ On this, see above, room 4, House A, Level 2. The wide distribution of the fragments of a single vase proves that the buildings as far apart as Houses A and F were destroyed simultaneously, and that

the houses of Level 2 were built over their ruins at one and the same time. This agrees with the fact that over the whole of this part of the site the Level 3 buildings are found to have been destroyed by fire.

of 35 Attic silver coins, *v. Num. Chron.*, xvii (1937), p. 5. Floor levels here had disappeared, and it was impossible to say whether the vase was on one floor or buried beneath another, *i.e.*, to date it on external evidence. Close to it lay a small lekythos of the usual local type (L 1) with bands of brown paint, but again the association of the two was uncertain. Since the coins are of the early part of the fourth century they must on internal evidence be assigned to our Level 3.

House G is not properly a warehouse but a row of shops built against the S.E. wall of the warehouses J and K, which with them formed the largest of the blocks excavated by us. Room 1 contained large amphorae of type 6. Room 2 had great numbers of the small local lekythi, type L 1, a copper jug, ladle, scale-pans and fragment of scale armour, MN. 394-9; room 3, quantities of clay loom-weights ⁴; room 9, numbers of Attic black paterae; room 10, large amphorae of types 8, 9 and 10; room 12 preserved part of a cement floor.

House H. The N.E. part of the building had been destroyed by the river and the N.W. part lay under the enclosure in which is the tomb of Sheikh Yusuf and could not be touched; the plan is therefore far from complete. What there is of it was complicated by various alterations and patchings of the original structure, some of the effect of which can be seen in the plan of the S.W. wall fronting on the street; it was impossible to make satisfactory sense of the incongruous remnants of rubble foundation which none the less do give an approximate line for the building. Room 1 was entered from the street by a flight of rubble steps, apparently, like the back wall of rooms 1 and 2 and the wall dividing them, not an original feature of the building; the addition of the steps should indicate a rise in level on the site during the period of Level 3. Of the curious partitions in rooms 8 and 9 no explanation was forthcoming. In room 10 there was a stratum of ashes in which were a few small Attic aryballi; in this room and in 11 were many fragments of Attic bell kraters, and in room 12 (most of which had been destroyed) there were Attic kotylae.

House J is a warehouse of normal type with a large courtyard open on one side wherein is the small chamber which we may call the tally-clerk's office; a single range of magazines surrounded the court.⁵ Of them, room J 3 contained large numbers of the little local lekythi (L 1, etc.); room J 8 was unusual in having a variety of types, the same local lekythos, the larger edition of the same type, a slender jug, type L 3, exactly like that which in House F was found to contain Attic coins, a flat bowl, diam. 0.29 m., with rudimentary ledge handles, of coarse drab clay, and a saucer of Attic black glaze ware; also a large steatite spindle-whorl.

House K. The northern part underlay the tomb of Sheikh Yusuf and was therefore not excavated. A quantity of mercury found loose in the soil in Sqq. C-D 6 (room K 2) may belong to this building, but should perhaps be attributed rather to Level 2. Room K 6 contained local

⁴ One-loom weaving establishments are a not uncommon feature of the modern Syrian bazaar, and the presence of loom-weights is no argument for the residential character of the building.

⁵ The rooms marked on the plan J 6, 7, 9 and 10 ought to be given to House K, seeing that the wall to the S.W. of them is continuous, whereas the walls to the N.E. are not uniform.

lekythi; that marked on the plan J 7 contained amphorae of types 4 and 5.

House N. The building was of anomalous type, merely a range of rooms, one or two abreast, lying between two streets and ending at a street on the S.E. Originally it was attached to House A, as shewn in the plan, but the building was destroyed by fire and re-built on the same lines, except that another street took the place of room 1 (see the plan of Level 2), thus isolating the building completely. Of the later walls only the stone rubble foundations survived, resting on a few courses of mud brick (again with rubble foundations) which belonged to the earlier phase. Whether both phases fell within the period of Level 3 or the later should be attributed to Level 2 there was nothing to shew; in view of this doubt the building is not reproduced on the Level 2 ground-plan.

Room 1 was only partly excavated. In the south corner there were some large amphorae of type 11 and fragments of a large jar of local fabric with decoration in brown paint. Room 2: On the clay floor there were stacked closely together amphorae of types 1, 3 and 9, the second being the most common; they contained remains of barley and of grapes; the floor was covered with ashes. Above them, associated with the walls of the later phase, were fragments of more amphorae and of a late Attic r.f. krater, and a long-handled bronze ladle, a fragment of scale armour and parts of an iron dagger. In rooms 3 and 4 there were more store-jars at both levels, the amphora type 1 belonging to the earlier; an example of this lay under the foundations of the upper wall dividing rooms 3 and 4; the upper walls were less solid than the lower and shewed no signs of burning, whereas the lower were heavily burned. Room 6 was partly paved with rough limestone blocks. Beyond, to the S.E., there remained one corner of another building; the one room of which a part survived had been full of amphorae of type 14. The room had been much destroyed by 3 rubbish-pits of late date and by a concrete wall of the Byzantine period, which ran across it; a big ribbed amphora, ht. 0.50 m., type 22, Fig. 28, which lay 0.15 m. above the fragments of the Greek jars, certainly belonged to the time of the late wall.

South-west of House N were the scanty remains of another building, *House P*, of which only a few incoherent fragments of walls were left. In one room there were amphorae of types 1, 3 and 14, and small local lekythi, together with fragments of a wide-mouthed pithos decorated with thumb-marks along the rim and a waved incised line between two relief bands below (Fig. 28, 25); against another wall were amphorae of type 14.



LEVEL 4.

House A. Although part only of the block was excavated, it seems to comprise a complete warehouse of the type which was to be standardised in Level 3. The rooms marked 16 and 17 on the plan belong to a separate establishment, as is shewn by the continuous wall dividing them from the rooms to the S.E. and the building consisting of rooms 1-15 again seems to be independent of anything which extended further to the N.E. The en-

trance was apparently by a passage between rooms A 4 and A 5; although the wall-foundations across either end of this were continuous, they may have served as threshold foundations, and at the inner end a large flat stone with worn surface seems to have been the actual door-sill. The passage led into the courtyard (A 1), which was paved with cobble-stones and had at its N.E. end a stone-lined bin sunk in the floor; the little room A 2 may have been the tally-clerk's office. The S.W. end of the building was complicated by extensive remodelling (the obviously late walls are marked '4 b' on the plan) as well as by an intrusive stone-built grave which was found ruined and empty; the rooms presented no features of particular interest, and the absence of floors resulted in a good deal of confusion of strata. Thus in the west part of the block the bottom of the Level 4 foundations lay only 1.50 m. below the present surface of the ground; the Level 4b foundations were at about the same depth; Level 5 was not more than 0.70 m. lower, and the walls might be standing 0.50 m. high and Rhodian Geometric wares and 'bird bowls' occurred between the foundations of the Level 4 walls; the Cypriote pottery came at 2.50 m. below the ground surface, associated with scanty wall remains, and the island Geometric below those. With the island Geometric wares were examples of local red plates of fine quality and a situla of coarse red clay, ht. 0.31 m., Fig. 27, 19. In room A 14, of which part of the pebble floor remained, there was against the middle of the N.E. wall a stone-built impost like that in room 1 of House E, Level 3, with which should be compared that in room E 3, Sq. F 7, Level 4. In room 15 there was a stone bench along the face of the S.E. wall.

House B occupied the west end of a block only partly excavated by us; its plan is incomplete, and its main interest lies in the fact that the building seems to have been entered by a long narrow cobble-paved passage, along one side of which ran a stone bench. In room B 6 there was a stone bench at the S.W. end; there had been sunk into the floor numbers of amphorae of type 5, and with them was a black clay cooking-pot, Fig. 27, 21. In room 7 the levels were most confused; at the same level as the walls were found a pair of copper scale-pans, numerous fragments of 'bird bowls' and of island kylikes, and a limestone head of Egyptian type, MNN. 130 (Pl. XII). In Sq. F 5 a lamp of Byzantine type occurred actually lower than the Level 4 wall foundations. Room B 1 was cobble-paved and seems to have been the courtyard of the building; in it there was an open fire-place against the wall of room B 2.

House E comprised rooms E 1-E 13, a large unexcavated area, and the rooms numbered 35-40; it is tempting to assume that rooms E 10, 11, 12 and 13 were originally part of the lane bordering the block on the S.E., and represent a later modification, but apart from a change in the angle of the N.E. wall there is no evidence for this. The raised mud-brick platform in room E 7 may mean that this was a shop; in room E 6 there was a large oven; in room E 3 a stone impost already referred to, *v.* House A, room 14. In room 37 the finding of a hinge-stone against a wall-foundation in which there was no break for a doorway proves that the rubble courses were normally taken across doorways as foundation for the sill, and explains



the apparent lack of communication between the rooms all over the site. The building lay so closely below Level 3 that discrimination was difficult and the strata were often confused; thus, in Sq. G 5, the fragments of a fine r.f. krater (see Level 3, House B, rooms 7-8) were found both in the ashes lying on the top of the Level 3 clay floor and also in ashes which underlay that floor; it was impossible to decide how the division of the fragments of a single vessel had occurred or to which stratum it should be assigned on the evidence of the find-spot.

House G. (Sqq. G 8, 9; H 6-10; J 4-8.) The building was anomalous and did not seem to conform to any recognisable plan. Whether all the rooms, numbered on the plan from 1 to 34, belong to the same building is quite uncertain; it is indeed unlikely that they did so, and the rooms 12-19, distinguished from the rest by an independent outer wall on the N.W. and S.W., probably belonged to a separate unit, and the long and continuous (but in part hypothetical) wall bounding on the S.E. the rooms 5, 6, 24, 25, 29 and 30 may also define the limits of one house. The fact is that although in one or two places the upper part of the walls built in mud-brick were fairly well preserved (shewn on the plan by shading), for the most part even the stone foundations were very fragmentary, and, as can be seen, had in many cases to be restored on scanty evidence. There had been a good deal of alteration and reconstruction which further complicated matters, this being most marked in the central part of the block, rooms 3, 4, 5 and 6; in the foundations of the (late) wall dividing rooms 6 and 11 there were found fragments of a fine krater by the Syleus Painter which date the reconstruction to a time soon after 480 B.C. The occurrence of hearths and ovens in rooms 3, 19, 27 and 28 gives a more domestic appearance than usual to this part of the site.

Room 1. The S.E. wall shewed two periods, the upper wall being at a slightly different angle and set back 0.20 m.-0.30 m. from the old; the S.W. side also shewed two periods, but the masonry coincided. In the south corner was a circular clay oven, diam. 0.65 m.

Room 2. The well-preserved clay floor of the earlier phase was covered with burnt rubbish above which was a second clay floor, 0.20 m. above the first. The mud brick work of the N.E. and S.E. walls was covered with a coating of bright red ochrous paste about 0.02 m. thick.

Room 3. This seems to have been originally an L-shaped room, but had later been modified by a very badly built skew wall, which in part replaced that between this room and room 4 and was apparently carried on further to the west; the wall between 3 and 6 was also apparently late, its foundations lying very high, almost in Level 3. In the south part there was a circular clay oven, diam. 0.65 m. Sunk in the floor level there was a vase, intact, of local ware, with a rough decoration in brown paint on a buff ground, Fig. 28, 24.

Room 4. All the walls except the N.W. belonged to the main period; the S.E. wall had been much destroyed by a late rubbish-pit.

Room 5. The floor was of clay over a stone rubble packing. The S.W. wall shewed two periods, not quite coinciding. The room was ruined by rubbish-pits. Sunk in the floor was an amphora of type 2.




FIG. 25.—METAL TOOLS, ETC.

Room 6. The N.E. wall was late; there were, however, remains of an older version of it at a lower level, a single course of rubble running somewhat askew; most of it had disappeared together with all the S.W. wall. The N.E. wall was of the older period; the S.E. wall preserved a little of its mud-brick superstructure. The pottery fragments found in this room, as in rooms 3 and 11, were of better quality than elsewhere in the building; most of the best Attic r.f. pieces came from room 6.

Room 7 was almost completely ruined by Arab rubbish-pits.

Room 8. The N.W. wall was of the early period, but its foundations were shallow, probably because it was a party wall; but the S.E. (external?) wall lay no deeper. Against the latter remained a patch of pebble floor surface.

Room 9 had in the east corner a patch of rubble floor at the same level as that in room 8. The S.W. wall was very heavy, having 7 courses of rubble of which 2 were below and 5 above floor level.

Room 10. The floor had been destroyed by a rubbish-pit in which was found a (broken) terra-cotta relief of the 4th century, MN. 109. Under the floor was an amphora, type 9, containing calcined human bones, with a skull beside it; a bone button was the only object. As the top of the pot was only about 0.10 m. below the bottom of the foundations of the room walls it was impossible to say whether this, the only example of cremation found, belonged to Level 4 or to Level 3. The walls of the room were built with from 2 to 4 courses of rubble with mud-brick above, well preserved in the S.E. wall; the bricks measured 0.40 m. \times 0.20 m. \times 0.12 m.

Room 11. This large room dated from Level 4 but was re-used in Level 3, when, however, it was divided.

Room 12. On the N.E. side of the room there remained a short stretch of the original wall; above and beyond this was a wall faced on the inside with good ashlar blocks behind which was rubble; its outer face had disappeared; the line given by the older wall does not agree with that of rooms 7 and 15, but it is bonded into the cross wall between 12 and 15, and lies at the same depth.

Room 13. The S.W. wall was shallow and presumably late; the others lay deeper (0.60 m.–0.80 m. below the floor of Level 3) and were contemporary.

Room 14. The S.W. wall was late and merely abutted on the N.W. wall with no bond of the lower courses, but the top rubble course seemed to bond, shewing that the two walls were contemporary in use. There was nothing to shew which of the two walls limiting rooms 13 and 14 on the N.W. and 8 and 9 on the S.E. respectively was the older. Under the floor and therefore assigned to Level 5 was the terra-cotta MN. 32 (Pl. X).

Rooms 15, 16. The mud-brick skew wall dividing the rooms was late—indeed it may have belonged to Level 3 only. Of the N.E. wall only part of the rubble core remained; no floor.

Room 17. The N.E. wall had deep rubble foundations whereon were traces of a mud-brick superstructure narrower than the foundations, but, as proved by their depth, contemporary with them; so was the N.W. wall, although its foundations were relatively shallow.




FIG. 26.—CLAY VASE TYPES ($\frac{1}{16}$).


Room 18. The floor (which lay 0.60 m. below that of Level 3) was of clay over a bedding of pebbles and gravel. The N.W. wall was of mud-brick only, the S.W. of mud brick on stone foundations, their foundations going down to the gravel floor bedding; the S.E. wall lay deeper, as did the N.E. The S.E. wall served as a foundation for that of Level 3. On the floor was much burnt wheat and fragments of an Attic b.f. kotyle.

Room 19. The clay floor lay 0.70 m. below that of Level 3. At the S.W. end of the room, 0.40 m. from the wall, there was a flat stone base 0.45 m. sq. and 0.10 m. high, whereon was a circular stone base or support, ht. 0.30 m., diam. 0.20 m. (wrongly described on the plan as an oven). The S.W. wall was of the same type and depth as the N.E. parallel wall of Room 20, which must be a separate building.


House S. Here again we found a maze of rather small rooms forming no intelligible plan. Very little good Attic pottery was found here, most of the rooms containing only local wares. In room S 18 the big amphora type 9 was associated with quantities of the little local lekythi (L 1), and in the same room were numerous clay loom-weights and a pair of copper scale-pans; in room S 27 many amphorae of type 14 were found lying on their sides, the pointed base of each inserted in the mouth of the next in the row. South of the squares 7-10 the fragments of the walls of Level 4 were so meaningless that the plan of them was not worth reproducing in spite of the amount of work done by us there. One curious point, however, is to be recorded. Throughout the whole area, including House S, the pottery of both Level 3 and Level 4 was poorer in quality than that elsewhere on the site, except A-E, 2, 3 and 4, where again it was poor though not quite to the same extent, and local wares were far more numerous in proportion to the imported Attic; moreover, where any good examples of Attic did occur, they very often shewed rivet-holes, having been broken and mended in antiquity, *e.g.*, the fine Dancing Scythian vase, MP. 115, found at the extreme south end of the excavated area, and two of the Panathenaic vases. Further, on both these parts of the site silver coins were noticeably few as compared with what had been found elsewhere, and only small copper coins were at all common. We were driven to conclude that in these areas, which represent the south and west limits of the classical town, the shops and warehouses were poorer and the traders dealt in cheap and in second-hand goods.

LEVELS 5 and 6.


As can be seen from the plan, these levels were too ruinous to merit much in the way of detailed description. In the first area excavated, Sqq. G-J 7-10, the evidence tended to shew that the buildings of Level 5 had been intentionally and systematically destroyed, even the foundations being rooted out; the change in time was made obvious by the change in the pottery which occurred immediately below the floors and foundations of Level 4, where Attic pottery ceased altogether and the imported wares came from Rhodes, Corinth, etc.; this stratum passed almost insensibly into the next, in which there was a slight change in the character of the




10




11




12




13




14




15




16




17




18



19



20




21


FIG. 27.—CLAY VASE TYPES (10).

sherds and a few fragments of wall foundation at a slightly lower level represented Level 6. Deliberate destruction was probably an accident that befell one particular part of the site; it does not amount to evidence of the destruction of the town as a whole, and elsewhere, *e.g.* in Sqq. A-C 2-3 there were signs of historic continuity in the buildings of Levels 5 and 4. It is to be remembered that in the objects found by us there is a time-gap of some thirty years between the apparent end of Period 5 and the beginning of Period 4 (see p. 20), suggesting a radical re-building of the harbour town; this would agree with the fact that in one place the Level 5 buildings are found to have been swept completely away, while in others elements of them are re-used in the new constructions. What is quite clear is that Levels 5 and 6 were very closely associated; there is little difference in the depth of their foundations, the buildings follow almost the same lines and the old walls are constantly re-used in the new buildings. Thus in Sqq. H-J 5, where there are two small rooms common to the two periods built against the N.E. side of long containing-walls which in the two periods are not coincident but contingent and parallel, the rubble foundations of the room walls of Level 5 are laid over the top of the room walls of Level 6 (these are marked "5 and 6" in the plan), but stop abruptly against the face of the more high-standing stonework of the Level 6 main house-wall; the latter was beneath the new floor, a new house-wall having been built alongside it, but it served as a foundation for the ends of the new party-walls whose mud-brick superstructure ran unbroken over the new foundations and the old wall's breadth. Here is at once the re-use and the modification which is to be expected when old buildings are adapted to meet new conditions and there is no violent break with the past.

The thoroughness of the destruction of the Level 5-6 buildings is well illustrated in Sq. J 8. Here below the floor of Level 4 no building remains at all were encountered for 1.45 m., and when at this depth a wall did appear it was a mere fragment belonging to Level 6; Level 5 had disappeared altogether. The Level 6 wall foundations stood only 0.20 m. high, and against them was a patch of clay floor on which stood a large terra-cotta bowl wherein was set a cylinder formed of the neck of a large amphora broken off its body; it was filled with wood ash and had apparently served as a hearth. The wall of Level 7 lay 0.40 m. below the bottom of the Level 6 foundations, and the wall of Level 8 at 0.45 m. below Level 7. In Sqq. E-F 6-8, on the other hand, the Level 5 buildings were tolerably well preserved, and even some of the pebble floors remained; in one case (Sq. E 8-9) there was a raised floor of limestone rubble. In Sq. E 7 there were three large clay pots sunk in the floor and surrounded by a packing of rough rubble; two were of types 6 and 10 respectively, and the third (fragmentary) was a painted local amphora of type 12. In Sqq. D 6 and C 7 there were other groups of big amphorae (types 2, 4 and 5); in Sq. H 8 there was in one case a store-jar, and in another a terra-cotta bottomless cylinder 0.60 m. in diameter sunk in the floor and surrounded by rubble packing; the latter, like the former, must have served as a sort of bin. The buildings in Sqq. B-D 2-3 and E, F 3-4, fragmentary though




22



23




24




25


Types of Clay Vessels.



L 1



L 2




L 3



L 4



L 5



L 6



Types of Lekythi ($\frac{2}{3}$).Types of Terra-cotta Figurines of Devotees ($\frac{2}{3}$).

FIG. 28.—CLAY VASE AND TERRA-COTTA TYPES.

they are,⁶ present distinct analogies with those of the upper levels; alike the character of the structures and the presence of store-jars in numbers prove that we are again at this level dealing with store-houses and magazines belonging to the port.

In Sq. H 6 there were three wells, mere pits going down to 0.60 m. below water-level, which apparently belonged to Level 6 although their presence could be detected only when the digging had gone deeper into Level 7; one was cut through a Level 8 wall and was therefore definitely of more recent date, but their exact relation to walls of Level 6 was difficult to determine. They contained a good deal of pottery, and the best examples of plain banded Rhodian jugs came from them (Pl. XIII).

The mud-bricks of Level 6 measured 0.40 m. \times 0.27 m. \times 0.12 m.; good examples were found preserved in Sq. H 8.

LEVELS 7-10.

Of the lower levels, 7 and 8 are closely united, one being simply a reconstruction of the other with little real change of plan; thus of the buildings in Sq. G-J, 7-9, it was remarked that the difference in actual level, measured from the bottoms of the foundation-courses, was only from 0.30 m. to 0.40 m., and that in many cases the walls were directly superimposed, the stone foundations of Level 7 resting on the lowest courses of mud-brick of Level 8. In neither case could the measurements of the mud-bricks be ascertained; the only noticeable difference in the character of the two sets of walls was that those of Level 7 had as foundations two or three courses of rounded river or beach pebbles (in this respect contrasting with later levels in which limestone rubble was used), while the pebble foundations of Level 8 were only one course thick. In this area no floors of Level 7 survived—only in rooms 1 and 2 a few rough stones may represent the floor foundations—but in room 8 the clay floor of Level 8 was preserved; as a consequence the stratification of the two levels was for the most part confused, and only general conclusions could be reached. Thus the local beakers of brown clay were more common in Level 7; in Level 8 the Cypriote wares which had been common in Level 7 were almost exclusively in use; with them came a rough lamp of the pinched saucer type (in room 8) and (in room 3, under the foundations of the Level 7 wall between 3 and 4) a big amphora of type 2; a similar amphora came from room 10; from room 4 came fragments of at least three others, type 2, and one of type 11, but it was doubtful whether the type 2 examples did not belong to Level 9. No sherds of island Geometric were found in either level. That the introduction of the Cypriote style of pottery was contemporary with the first buildings of Level 8 was clearly shewn, *e.g.* in room 8, where there was a vast quantity of Cypriote sherds mixed with a layer of rough stones which were a floor-foundation of that room in the Level 8 period; the walls of Level 9 lay only 0.30 m. below those of Level 8, but the change of pottery

⁶ In no case was more than the foundation preserved; even where the pebble floors survive, as in Sq. E 4, the rubble masonry does not stand above floor level.

was complete. The fine krater with a scene of fighting bulls (Fig. 5, p. 17), was found between two layers of cobble floor-foundation, both of which were associated with the Level 8 walls, and betokened a reconstruction during the period. Similarly the fine flat plates of local fabric, made of very smooth pink clay decorated with concentric circles in red paint, which occurred freely in Level 8 and upwards, were absolutely lacking below the Level 8 floors.

An impost-stone in room 10 belonged to Level 7; its position did not seem consistent with its being the base of a constructional upright. In room 6 there were found several scarabs of blue paste and a cylinder seal of the same material engraved with a wild goat (MN. 350); these were attributed to Level 7 but more probably belonged to Level 8. Between rooms 1 and 7, but below the Level 7 wall foundations, and therefore belonging to Level 8, were various fragments of bronze, including six fibulae of types 4, 7 and 8, and the bronze object MN. 229, Fig. 25.

Of Levels 9 and 10 very little remained. The difference in depth between the floors of Levels 8 and 10 varied from 0.80 m. to no more than 0.60 m.; the floors both of Level 9 and of Level 10 were of clay, generally laid directly on the natural sand; wall foundations consisted of small pebbles, and the buildings can have been nothing better than huts. In the Level 9 buildings there were found a number of very large buffalo horns, unworked. In Sq. C-G no remains of Level 10 could be distinguished, and it is possible that the town of that date did not extend so far in this direction.

SECTION 2. STONE COFFIN GRAVES.

MNN. 1. Limestone coffin cut out of a single block, 2.04 m. \times 0.61 m. \times 0.47 m. deep (internally), orientated N.E. \times S.W.; a single slab formed the lid. Undisturbed. In it two bodies side by side, both fully extended, one, ♂, with both arms straight by sides, the other, ♀, with left arm across breast; heads N.E. Against the head of each an alabastron, type 1, Fig. 19, 0.175 m. high, MNN. 38, A & B; by the feet an alabastron, type 6, ht. 0.077 m., MNN. 37; also a bronze mirror, plain, diam. 0.10 m., with bronze kohl-stick l. 0.15 m., MNN. 35, A & B; and an alabaster saucer, type 5, Fig. 19, diam. 0.115 m., ht. 0.016 m., MNN. 36, and 7 small copper rings and rivets lying in disorder close to the feet. Against the leg of the ♀ body were 7 short shell tubes, l. 0.008 m., diam. 0.009 m., each pierced centrally and with a second hole from the side to the centre, 4 shell studs, mushroom-shaped, with short shanks, l. 0.01 m., diam. 0.01 m., and 4 gold caps consisting of a tube 0.005 m. long \times 0.005 m. in diam., stopped at one end by a gold disk, each having soldered to its side a gold wire loop from which hangs by a ring a minute gold disk, and one has a smaller tube soldered to the main tube at right angles on the side opposite to the disk pendant; all may perhaps be parts of a musical instrument; MNN. 39. By the right wrist of the ♀ body were many minute copper ball beads and a few stone beads. At the neck, beads, 2 gold-ribbed balls, copper, carnelian and agate balls, cylinders and faceted lozenges and amethyst faceted date-shaped; also an oval silver clasp set with small penannular gold rings and a copper coin, MNN. 40. Two small silver lunate ear-rings were found, in bad condition. Outside but against the coffin was a broken gold tassel pendant like those of MN. 344, Fig. 9, p. 25.

MNN. 2. The coffin was built of three courses of ashlar limestone; there was no lid; possibly it had been of wood and had decayed, but as the grave was disturbed the evidence was not decisive. The body lay extended on its back, the head East. With it were fragments of a silver purse resembling MN. 421, Pl. XIII, but in hopeless condition; fragments of silver lunate ear-rings and plain wire rings; one ribbed gold ball bead;

fragments of a plain bronze mirror; a bone kohl-tube, lathe-turned, l. 0.12 m., diam. 0.03 m., with copper kohl-stick inside, MNN. 77. A number of silver two-string beads, a few yellow paste beads, a glass scaraboid, and a silver and a bronze ring bezel, MNN. 88.

MNN. 3. Coffin built of three courses of ashlar limestone, with floor and roof of stone slabs. Undisturbed. The body lay extended on its back, the head East. With the body were 2 steatite spindle-whorls, fragments of a silver chain, two copper and one silver coins.

MNN. 4. Built of three courses of ashlar limestone. Empty.

MNN. 5. Coffin formed of thin limestone slabs set upright on edge, two forming each side, one each end; earth floor; the lid was of thin slabs of stone, some of which had been removed. Grave disturbed in antiquity. The body lay extended on its back, the head S.E., the hands over the breast. Loose in the filling was a gold finger-ring with plain hoop and oval bezel in which is set a paste gem, originally intaglio but now completely decayed, MNN. 80. Also a number of beads, some silver, one carnelian and many of black and blue glass, a glass pendant in the form of a bearded man's face, 3 in the form of birds in black, white and green glass; also 2 glass finger-rings; MNN. 85. There were also fragments of a copper dish and a fragment of a vase of variegated 'Phoenician' glass.

MNN. 6. Coffin built with three courses of ashlar limestone. Opened in antiquity and empty. Against it were found 3 alabastra, ht. 0.096 m., type 2, Fig. 19. MNN. 99. They certainly belonged to the burial.

MNN. 7. Coffin built of ashlar limestone, 2.40 m. \times 1.00 m.; the lid was on the level of the foundations of the walls of Level 3. Orientated N. \times S. Body extended with head to N. In the coffin quantities of decayed wood, perhaps from a wooden coffin, and remains of an alabastron, type 1, Fig. 19.

MNN. 8. Coffin built of ashlar limestone, 2.3 m. \times 1.20 m. \times 1.00 m. the sides of slabs *ca.* 1.00 m. \times 0.50 m. \times 0.07 m., the lid of slabs 1.15 m. \times 0.60 m. \times 0.16 m. Orientated E. \times W. Body extended on its back, the head E. No objects.

MNN. 9. Coffin made of thin slabs of limestone set on edge, 1.15 m. \times 0.50 m., orientated N. \times S. The cover broken and the grave disturbed. In two of the corners lay large copper nails, perhaps from a wooden coffin. Inside, 8 large alabastra and one small one, all much decayed, types 1 and 2; 3 vases of red clay, fragmentary; a terra-cotta bust, MN. 424 (Pl. X); a gold ear-ring (plain hoop); some iron nails and the bones and teeth of a small child.

MNN. 10. Coffin built of rough bits of limestone, 1.20 m. \times 0.48 m., the lid of thin limestone slabs, the floor of large potsherds. Some bones and teeth of a child. With the bones 5 alabastra, type 1, in bad condition, MN. 82.

MNN. 11. Coffin 2.10 m. \times 0.60 m. \times 0.88 m. deep built of three courses of ashlar limestone, the blocks 0.46 m. \times 0.29 m. \times 0.15 m. No lid; the grave apparently plundered. No bones. In the filling one alabastron, type 1, ht. 0.17 m., and another ht. 0.07 m. MN. 81.

The grave cuts into the wall foundations of Level 4 and the shaft could be traced up to Level 3 floor level.

MNN. 12. Sarcophagus of hammer-dressed limestone, a single block 2.06 m. \times 0.61 m. \times 0.45 m. deep, lid of a single slab 2.18 m. \times 0.68 m. \times 0.115 m., with the top surface slightly convex. Orientated N. \times S. Close to each corner was a block of stone roughly 0.50 m. \times 0.20 m. and 0.45 m. high, set on end; they perhaps served for getting the coffin into position. Body extended on back, head N. No objects. (Pl. III).

MNN. 13. Coffin built of 3 courses of adze-dressed limestone ashlar, blocks 0.50 m. \times 0.47 m.; coffin 2.10 m. \times 0.65 m. \times 0.90 m. high, internal measurements; lid of limestone slabs. Body extended on back, head N.E. No objects.

MNN. 14. Coffin built of 3 courses of limestone ashlar, orientated roughly N. \times S.; lid of limestone slabs. Body extended on back, head S. Remains of an alabastron by the feet; traces of wood, perhaps from a wooden coffin.

MNN. 15. Coffin built of 3 courses of limestone ashlar, 2.04 m. \times 0.71 m., lid of limestone slabs; orientated N.E. \times S.W. Iron nails lying along the sides of the stonework suggest an inner coffin of wood. Body extended on back, head N.E., hands on pelvis. In the coffin an iron knife-blade and an iron arrow-head, both much decayed: one head of blue paste and some remains of copper; against the outside of the coffin near the feet an alabastron, type 2. MNN 99.

SECTION 3. BEADS AND AMULETS.

The commonest type of amulet at al Mina was a small grotesque mask, human or semi-human, made of polychrome glass. They are always fitted with a ring for suspension, and average from 0.02 m. to 0.025 m. in height; they are not moulded but hand-modelled, and the details are rendered by applying to the unfinished head pellets or strips of glass of a different colour, *i.e.*, by the 'snow-man' technique familiar to the worker in clay. They are certainly of Syrian manufacture, a by-product of the glass-making industry, whose *chef d'oeuvre* was the vase in 'combed' variegated glass such as MN. 413 (Pl. XIII), found in Level 7: the numerous examples found by us must be strays from stocks collected in the harbour for export. It is worth remarking that fragments of variegated glass vessels occur most freely in Level 4, rarely in Level 3 (though that is the level which, owing to the destruction of buildings by fire, gives a much more representative series of objects than does any other level) and not at all in Level 2; of the grotesque masks we have none from Level 2, ten from Level 3, fifteen from Level 4, five from Level 5, and none from the earlier levels; the traffic in them would therefore seem to have been confined to the period between the sixth century and about 400 B.C., and was most active in the first half of the fifth century.

Very different from those are the moulded glass pendants with human faces in relief; here the types are purely Greek and there is none of the grotesque caricature to which the 'snow-man' technique lends itself so readily.

Amulets of other forms, made of glass or of glazed frit, generally shew Egyptian influence, and many are actually of Egyptian (Naukratite?) manufacture, although some are local copies of Egyptian originals. Where the material is the uniform blue lapis-lazuli paste, such as is commonly employed for small ornamental scarabs, a Naukratite origin may safely be assumed; in the case of glazed frit there can be no such certainty, seeing that a good deal of glazed frit work was done in Syria; the few examples in polychrome glass should be classed with the grotesque masks as Syrian. The polychrome eye-beads I take to be Syrian also, although their wide distribution makes the point doubtful; it is perhaps only a proof of the importance of the Syrian trade.

For the sake of convenience the beads and amulets are here listed together instead of being divided between the different levels in which

they occurred; while the bulk of them are of glass or glazed frit, I have classed with them a few examples in other materials, stone or metal, on the grounds of similarity of subject, just as I have included here examples of eye-beads on the grounds of similarity of technique with the comic mask pendants. It will be noted that the most characteristically Egyptian amulets, figurines of Bes, Horus, Osiris, etc., predominate in the lower levels of the site, 6-8; this fact points to the dependence of the Egyptian trade on the activities of the Greek station at Naukratis and its relative unimportance after the close of the sixth century when that station had been closed down.

Glass Mask Pendants.

- MN. 15. Male head, blue and yellow glass, ht. 0.023 m. Level 3.
 MN. 24. Comic head in blue and white glass; fragmentary. Level 3.
 MN. 28. Bearded male head, face black, eyes yellow, beard and eye-brows white. Level 4.
 MN. 39. Comic head, face blue, ears white, eyes white and yellow. Level 5. Pl. XIV.
 MN. 40. Ditto; face black, hair and eyebrows white. Level 5. Pl. XIV.
 MN. 167. Moulded pendant of clear glass with a woman's head in relief on each side ht. 0.015 m. Level 2.
 MN. 169. Cylindrical form, bearded male head. Level 3.
 MN. 170. Similar to 169. Level 3.
 MN. 171. Similar to 169. Level 4.
 MN. 172. Similar; broken at mouth. Level 4.
 MN. 173. Similar; Level 3.
 MN. 174. Similar, with long beard; broken above the eyes. Level 3.
 MN. 175. Similar; fragmentary. Level 5.
 MN. 176. Similar, with short beard. Level 4.
 MN. 177. Similar; fragmentary.
 MN. 409. Head; face white, eyes black. Level 3.
 MN. 410. Head; white, black and yellow glass. Level 3.
 MN. 411. Head; face red, cap white, eyes blue and white, dark beard. Lower part broken. Level 3.
 MN. 420. Moulded pendant of clear white glass in form of a woman's head framed in heavy hair; the face repeated on each side. Level 3.
 MN. 423. Comic head; face blue, eyes brown and white, remains of yellow on eyebrows and whiskers. Level 5.
 MN. 425. Comic head; face yellow, beard black, eyes black and white.
 MN. 445. Comic head; now bleached white; imperfect. Level 5(?).
 MNN. 28. Comic head in blue and white glass. Level 4. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 31. Ditto; red face, white eyes, yellow ears and hair. Level 4. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 44. Ditto; yellow face, black beard and eyebrows, black and white eyes. Level 3. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 54. Ditto; face reddish-brown, yellow mouth and hair, white and brown eyes. Level 5. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 55. Ditto; blue face with red and white eyes. Level 4. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 58. Moulded pendant of clear glass, human face in relief; oval; ht. 0.014 m.; fragmentary. Level 4.
 MNN. 62. Comic head; face yellow, eyes black, beard and hair blue. Level 4 (or 5?). Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 63. Moulded pendant of clear glass in the form of a bearded head, full face, in the room 1; pierced vertically for suspension. Ht. 0.015 m. Level 4. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 92. Comic head; blue glass with yellow edging round beard, hair and eyes, eye pupils black. Level 4. Pl. XIV.
 MNN. 93. Ditto; half of face yellow, half white; black eyebrows and hair. Level 4. Pl. XIV.

Other amulets and beads.

MN. 13. Glass pendant in the form of a bird; the body striped white and yellow, the head yellow, the eyes blue; ht. 0.03 m. Level 3. Pl. XIV.

MN. 14. Glass pendant in the form of a jug with trefoil mouth and twisted handle; blue and yellow glass in combed bands, imitating the ordinary 'Phoenician' glass vessel. Ht. 0.023 m. Level 3.

MN. 16. Glass pendant in the form of a small flask; clear blue glass. Level 3. Ht. 0.014 m. Pl. XIV.

MN. 17. Glass pendant in the form of a small flask, blue glass, ht. 0.015 m. Level 3. Pl. XIV.

MN. 18. Glass pendant in the form of a bird (hawk?); yellow and white stripes, bleached; ring broken. Ht. 0.021 m. Level 3. Pl. XIV.

MN. 25. Bead, flattened biconical, a 'stratified eye-bead' (cf. Seligman and Beck, *Far Eastern Glass*, in *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, Stockholm, 1938) with two rows of white circle eyes on a blue ground. Ht. 0.01 m. Level 3.

MN. 51. Glass pendant in the form of an amphora, clear glass; ht. 0.014 m. Level 2. Pl. XIV.

MN. 115. Fragment, legs to the knee, of a draped figurine in blue-glazed frit; ht. 0.085 m. Level 8.

MN. 116. Blue-glazed frit amulet of a hawk wearing the double crown of Egypt; ht. 0.03 m. Level 8.

MN. 117. Legs, the left advanced, of a standing male figure in blue-glazed frit; Egyptian style; ht. 0.026 m. Level 8.

MN. 118. Blue-glazed figurine of Bes, ht. 0.03 m. Level 8.

MN. 119. Blue-glazed frit amulet in the form of a negro's head; ht. 0.015 m. Level 4.

MN. 120. Head and shoulders of a blue-glazed figurine of a female (Isis?) with the arms raised above the head. Ht. 0.018 m. Level 4.

MN. 121. Fragment of a relief in blue-glazed frit; head of a hippopotamus. Ht. 0.018 m. Level 4.

MN. 166. Pendants of clear glass, many in the forms of vases, jugs and amphorae. Level 3.

MN. 178. Bead, cylindrical, with stratified eyes; ground black, eyes with blue rings and yellow stud centres. Level 3.

MN. 180. Set of amulets, Horus eyes in blue-glazed frit. Level 3.

MN. 319. Blue-glazed frit figurine, a man, headless, crouched before a table of offerings; Egyptian style; ht. 0.028 m. Level 7.

MN. 320. Small figure of a seated god, Osiris (?), in blue-glazed frit. Ht. 0.016 m. Level 8.

MN. 338. Figure in blue-glazed frit of a standing man; Egyptian style. Ht. 0.045 m. Level 7.

MN. 361. Amulet of glazed frit in the form of a figure wearing an Egyptian pectoral. Ht. 0.027 m. Level 8.

MN. 412. Horus-eye amulet in glazed frit, blue (? bleached) and black; length 0.037 m. Level 7.

MN. 415. Upper part of figurine of Osiris in glazed frit, the colour now bleached; ht. 0.028 m. Level 5.

MN. 422. Lower half of a figurine of a squatting Bes in blue-glazed frit, now bleached white. Ht. 0.033 m. Level 3.

MNN. 67. Horus-eye amulet silhouetted in mother-of-pearl; l. 0.018 m. Level 4.

MNN. 71. Pendant of lapis-lazuli paste in the form of a papyrus-head. Ht. 0.012 m. Level 4-5. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 118. Lower half of a figurine in pale green steatite; composite animal squatted with fore-feet resting on its knees; eagle's hind feet, lion's (?) body and fore feet, wings. Ht. 0.025 m. Level 3. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 139. Amulet of blue-glazed frit; head of Bes. Ht. 0.013 m. Level 3. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 146. Bronze amulet, a squatting ram (?), length 0.025 m. Level 5. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 147. Amulet of black and white glass; a squatting jackal. Length 0.02 m. Level 5. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 153. Amulet of light green steatite; Horus hawk wearing the double crown. Feet and stand missing. Ht. 0.042 m. Level 6-7. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 155. Amulet of blue-glazed frit; squatting figure of Bes; the head missing. Ht. 0.03 m. Level 7-8. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 162. Amulet of glazed frit, the glaze perished; the infant Harpokrates. Ht. 0.032 m. Level 8. Pl. XIV.

SECTION 4. SEALS

A. *Conical Seals*

This form of seal is characteristic of the Persian period. Two good examples were found:

MN. 127. Haematite; ht. 0.025 m.; a Persian king between two lions; Level 3. Pl. XV.

MNN. 123. Green jasper; ht. 0.026 m., diam. 0.019 m.; a king or god who grasps an antelope by the horns with either hand. Level 3. Pl. XV.

All the rest with one exception are moulded in glass; they vary in size, the height ranging from 0.01 m. to 0.025 m. The cone is pierced laterally for suspension. The intaglios were originally poor, owing to the nature of the material, and have suffered by the decomposition and flaking of the glass to such an extent that the design is often unrecognisable; the best of them are figured on Pl. XV. The main interest of these seals is the level at which they were found; they belong to the latter part of the fifth and to the fourth centuries B.C.; only two were recorded as being found in low levels, MN. 339 in Level 6, MN. 318 in Level 7, and it is probable that their occurrence there was due to the disturbance of the soil.

From Level 4 come MN. 124, 125, 126, 182, 352, 353, 362, MNN. 57 (Pl. XV), 64 (Pl. XV), 65 (two examples).

From Level 3 come MN. 31, 139, 140, 183, 408 (four examples), and MNN. 134 (Pl. XV), numerous examples, some of which belong to Level 2.

MN. 123 was of baked clay with a roughly incised design of volutes.

B. *Classical Intaglios.*

MNN. 124. Glass; oval, 0.019 m. \times 0.015 m.; a female head in profile, the hair dressed in close ringlets. Pl. XV. Level 2-3.

MNN. 135. Glass; rectangular, with indistinct moulded design. Level 2-3.

C. *Stone Seals of various types in local styles.*

MNN. 5. Rectangular stamp seal of dark steatite, 0.034 m. sq., with loop handle. Through the upper part are pierced two holes which form part of the design; below, lozenge pattern. Pl. XV. Level 1.

MNN. 68. Rectangular stamp seal of dark steatite, 0.024 m. \times 0.02 m., with rounded corners and tubular handle. Roughly engraved with two disjointed animals. Pl. XV. Level 4-5.

MNN. 144. Rectangular stamp seal of dark steatite, 0.02 m. \times 0.014 m. with rounded corners and loop handle; roughly engraved with figures of a man and an animal. Pl. XV. Level 4.

MNN. 145. Rectangular stamp seal of dark steatite, 0.016 m. sq., originally with loop handle which is now missing. Pl. XV. Level 4.

MNN. 136. Stamp seal, oval, of dark steatite, 0.02 m. \times 0.017 m., with rounded top; crudely engraved with a figure of a bird. Level 4.

MN. 45. Stamp seal, oval, of jasper, l. 0.10 m., top convex; engraved in the 'Island' style of the 7th century with a figure of a bird. Level 6.

MN. 128. Cylindrical pebble, diam. 0.17 m.; on the top a crude linear design. Level 3.

MN. 129. Stamp seal, oblong, of haematite, l. 0.011 m. Design of a goat. Level 4.

MN. 130. Stamp seal, of pebble, flat oval, l. 0.016 m. Crude design of sun and stars. Level 3.

MN. 317. Stamp seal, oval, of pebble, l. 0.022 m.; crudely engraved with figure of a man with raised arms, linear pattern on either side. Pl. XV. Level 7.

MN. 379. Stamp seal, oval, of dark steatite, l. 0.015 m., with rounded top; very roughly engraved with figures of a man (?) and a star (?). Level 5-6.

MN. 380. Stamp seal, circular, of bone, diam. 0.012 m., flat sides; roughly engraved with design of a winged horse (?). Level 2.

MN. 432. Stamp seal, circular, of grey steatite, diam. 0.023 m., originally with a handle which is now missing. Design of a running goat. Pl. XV. Level uncertain but apparently Level 8-9.

MN. 434. Stamp seal, circular, of grey stone, diam. 0.018 m., crudely engraved with animal scene. Pl. XV. Level 7-8.

MN. 451. Stamp seal, circular, of fine-grained limestone, diam. 0.02 m., with round top (chipped); design of a winged animal standing within a hatched border. Pl. XV. Level 7-8.

D. Cylinder Seals.

MN. 190. Pink stone, ht. 0.018 m. Design of men and trees. Level 5.

MN. 191. Buff paste, originally glazed (?), ht. 0.022 m. Crude design of man (?) and snake. Level 7.

MN. 316. Chalcedony, ht. 0.024 m., fragmentary. Roughly-engraved design of stars, etc. Level 7.

MN. 350. Blue paste, ht. 0.024 m. A wild goat. Level 4.

MN. 360. White steatite, ht. 0.023 m. Draped human figure and snake. Pl. XV. Level 8.

MN. 405. Grey steatite, with rough design of circles and striations. Level 5.

MNN. 1. Chalcedony, ht. 0.035 m., diam. 0.015 m. Well cut, with a design of gods, worshippers, etc.; a very fine example of the Syro-Hittite eclectic style of gem-engraving. Pl. XV. Found loose in the surface soil.

MNN. 107. Cylinder of dark steatite, unpierced, but with a small loop handle at one end; on the other end are engraved a crescent moon and seven stars. L. 0.031 m., diam. 0.01 m. The main design is of small figures of archers shooting at animals. Level 4-5.

E. Scarabs and Scaraboids.

The scarab and scaraboid seals can be divided into classes according to their material; most common are those of white steatite, Egyptian both in material and in design, though it is possible that some at least were of local manufacture, for in the case of MN. 141 fifteen such scarabs were found together. By no means all the subjects (human beings, birds and animals) are specifically Egyptian, and the engraving is so rough, in contrast to the cutting of the scarab itself, as to seem unfinished; perhaps plain scarabs were imported and the engraving was done locally. Very few of the steatite scarabs had ever been glazed, but some of glazed frit were found, and these certainly are Egyptian imports. A great number are of blue paste, most of them small in size and rather roughly engraved, though since they have suffered much from the disintegration of the surface they

may originally have been better than they appear now; they seem to be of Naukratite manufacture. Scarabs in hard stone were rare, only four being found; three in moulded glass seem to belong to the close of the series.

The distribution of the scarabs between the different levels is as follows:

- Level 3* : steatite, 21; glazed frit, 1; blue paste, 2; glass, 1.
Level 4 : steatite, 4; glazed frit, 8; blue paste, 5.
Level 5 : steatite, 1; glazed frit, 3; blue paste 9; glass, 2.
Level 6 : steatite, 3; glazed frit, 2; blue paste, 3; stone, 2.
Level 7 : steatite, 5; glazed frit, 1; blue paste, 1; stone, 1.
Level 8 : steatite, 5; glazed frit, 3; blue paste, 8.
Levels 8-9 : blue paste, 5.

As can be seen, the varieties are fairly evenly distributed, and the evidence is not sufficient to shew any development or fluctuations of fashion.

The scarabs and scaraboids illustrated on Pl. XV include the more important examples and others typical of the series in general; many, especially of those moulded in blue paste, were originally poor and are now so decayed as to possess little interest; they are therefore suppressed.

MN. 35. Steatite scarab. Within a cable-pattern border a Greek hoplite advancing l., a hound at his side; he wears Corinthian helmet, shield and sword. Excellent work, archaic Ionic. Level 4.

MN. 44. White steatite scarab. Base divided by a line into two compartments; in the left a falcon, in the right a royal name, Rā'-men- . . . Type, *Naukratis I*, Pl. 37, Nos. 71, 72. Level 5.

MN. 138. Green jasper scaraboid. A bull with high arching horns facing right; before him an ankh, above him a triangle. Level 2.

MN. 154. White steatite scarab. Above, a sun disk and a couchant sphinx holding a *hes* vase; in the centre a royal name in cartouche, Men-kheper-Rā', protected by the goddess Uajyt as an uraeus with outspread wings; below, a *neb* sign. Men-kheper-Rā' is considered by Petrie to have been a vassal of the XXVth Dynasty (*Scarabs and Cylinders*, 32), but by others the name is thought to be merely a revival for amuletic purposes of the prenomen of Thothmes III; e.g., Gauthier, *Livre des Rois*, 74, 90. XXVth Dynasty. Level 8.⁷

MN. 351. Steatite scarab. Isis approached by a diminutive figure wearing the double crown of Egypt, who is followed by a second figure wearing a kilt. Level 4.

MN. 381. Scarab of glazed frit, the glaze perished. A standing figure advancing right holding the *User* staff; behind him an ankh, etc. Level 6.

MN. 418. Scarab, of white paste once glazed, now bleached white. Two royal names in cartouches, Men-kheper-Rā' and Neb-ka-Rā'.

MN. 141. Eight (out of fifteen) small steatite scarabs found together, unglazed. All engraved in Syrian style with animal figures, many of them compound beasts.

SECTION 5. OBJECTS OTHER THAN POTTERY, SEALS AND AMULETS FOUND IN THE VARIOUS LEVELS.

Level 2.

The following are the more important of the objects found in Level 2; for the most part they were found loose in the soil and could not be definitely associated with any one room:

⁷ For the notes on MN 44 and 154 I am indebted to the late Alan Shorter.

MN. 1. Terra-cotta figurine of a bearded horseman, Persian type, ht. 0.118 m. Sq. H 8. Several fragmentary examples of the same type were found, all in Level 2. Pl. X.

For other terra-cottas see below, MN. 2, 28, 58, 84, 85, 86, 109.

MN. 2. Terra-cotta relief, female figure standing full face, all above the waist missing; ht. 0.95 m. Sq. H 7. Pl. X.

MN. 3. Marble head, life-size, of a city goddess wearing the battlemented crown; the ears pierced for ear-rings, the hair, which is brushed back from the forehead, shewing traces of red paint; nose, mouth and chin broken away. Good Hellenistic work. Sq. H 9. Fig. 12.

MN. 4. Fragment of a statuette of white marble, from the waist to below the knee, of a draped male figure; ht. 0.11 m. Good style. Sq. H 7.

MN. 8. Silver fibula, angular type, to which is attached a silver chain, square in section, ending in a rosette ornament with two acorn-shaped pendants. L. of fibula 0.04 m.

MN. 9. Bronze arrow-head, solid type, A 1, square in section l. 0.045 m. Cf. Fig. 25.

MN. 10. Bronze arrow-head, leaf-shaped, with tang, Type A 4, l. 0.041 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 11. Terra-cotta figurine, hand-modelled, fragment; head of an animal, Syrian type; ht. 0.05 m.

MN. 12. Bronze fibula, Type 8, Fig. 17; l. 0.045 m. Many other examples of the type were found.

MN. 19. Bronze disk with scalloped rim and incised radial lines, a flanged hole in the centre and 4 holes near edge wherethrough copper nails. Diam. 0.115 m. Sq. F 9.

MN. 26. Copper dish, shallow and flat, with vertical sides and 2 loop handles; diam. 0.25 m. Fig. 18.

MN. 28. Terra-cotta figurine of Persian horseman, as MN. 1. Pl. X.

MN. 58. Terra-cotta relief, fragment; head of goddess, full face, wearing calathus and side fillets; ht. 0.045 m. Pl. X.

MN. 59. Fragment of a white marble slab, 0.19 m. \times 0.19 m., whereon part of inscription in late lettering.

--- ATPO ---
 -- ΥΠΕΡΝ ---
 --- \ΥΤΟΟΚ ---
 --- / ΚΛΙ ---

MN. 77. Alabastron, of banded alabaster, Type 4, Fig. 19; ht. 0.10 m. Broken and mended. House A, room 15.

MN. 84, 85. Terra-cotta reliefs, heads from, similar to MN. 58. Pl. X.

MN. 86. Terra-cotta relief, fragment of, of a nude woman holding her breasts: the head missing; traces of red paint, Ht. 0.92 m. Babylonian style. Pl. X. Fig. 28.

MN. 109. Terra-cotta relief, fragments of; a large plaque covered with white slip and originally painted; scene of two women at a stele, with Nike or Eros. Hellenistic work.

MN. 235. Bronze weight in the form of a Cretan goat, recumbent. Round its neck is twisted a thin metal bar which may represent a rope but is perhaps only added to adjust the weight. Ht. 0.06 m. Fig. 24. Level 2.

MN. 273. Bronze tweezers, the ends plain, on the sides incised circles and bars: l. 0.06 m. A plain example was MN. 279.

MN. 277. Bronze ear-rings, of crescent or lunate form, plain. These were found in great numbers.

MN. 278. Bronze finger-rings, slender hoops with flat oval bezels originally engraved but now for the most part corroded away. A great many such were found in Levels 2 and 3.

MN. 285. Bronze fibulae, Type 8; the type was very common in this level. Fig. 17.

MN. 309, 310. Iron adzes, l. 0.12 m. and 0.13 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 321. Bronze ornament in the form of a uraeus of coiled wire with flattened head; l. 0.027 m.

MN. 324. Iron scissors, of very modern type, l. 0.24 m. A similar pair, but fragmentary, is MN. 325.

MN. 373. Iron tool with square blade and straight tang, perhaps a hoe; width of blade 0.08 m., l. of blade 0.10 m., total l. 0.24 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 374. Iron tool (hoe?), socketed, with almost circular blade; l. 0.13 m., width 0.105 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 387. Limestone head, nearly life-size (ht. 0.20 m.), of a bearded male figure. Cypriote. The hair is combed from the centre, bound by a fillet from which rise laurel leaves, and falls behind in a short chignon with criss-cross plaiting; there was apparently a row of small curls across the forehead, but these are defaced. The beard is carefully trimmed and curled. The eyes are slightly aslant and flush with the forehead; the cheekbones rounded and highly prominent; the nose broad with strongly marked lines above the upper lip. From the middle of the upper lip the beard and chin are broken away. The nose is broken, the left side of the face much damaged, all the surface of the stone poor. Found built into the S.E. wall of House F, Sq. F 6.

MN. 388. Stone mould for jeweller's work, 0.12 m. \times 0.04 m.; roughly cut in the face is a circular medallion, diam. 0.032 m. with concentric rings and radial lines. It was perhaps intended for impressed work rather than for casting.

MN. 389. Bone palette, rectangular, 0.045 m. \times 0.037 m., rounded, and bevelled below and having in the top a circular depression, diam. 0.032 m.

MN. 390. Bone spoon, l. 0.09 m.

MN. 391. Bronze saucer, of heavy metal, diam. 0.065 m., ht. 0.015 m., with base-ring; flat rim; in the centre of the bowl a dotted circle in relief.

MN. 392. Bronze ferrule (?), hollow-socketed, with solid point. L. 0.175 m. Fig. 25.

MNN. 2, 11. Bone spindle-whorls, decorated with incised circles and lines; Pl. XIII. Plain spindle-whorls were found in great numbers.

MNN. 17. Silver ingot; an oval of metal 0.12 m. \times 0.10 \times 0.005 m. thick, curved into a semicircle; unmarked.

MNN. 100. Copper ladle with shallow bowl, diam. 0.10 m., and long tang; total l. 0.195 m.

MNN. 116. Terra-cotta figurine of a child, small and fat, wearing a vest reaching to the navel and a short cloak, seated on the ground with one knee raised and caressing an animal which resembles a baby bear. The child's head is missing. Ht. 0.055 m. Poor Greek work. Pl. XI.

MNN. 120. Jar-handle whereon a stamp. Fig. 20.

MNN. 140. Jar-handle whereon a stamp. Fig. 20.

Level 3.

The following are the more important objects found in Level 3; where it is not otherwise stated they were loose in the soil and could not be definitely associated with any one room.

MN. 7. Fragment of a limestone statuette of a woman standing and wearing chiton and cloak; ht. 0.11 m.; Cypriote late archaic style of the early 5th century. Found by (? below) the bin of small lekythi in Sq. F 9.

MN. 21. Basalt trough, rectangular and four-legged, the legs joined by a round bar; at each corner a crudely-carved bull's head, at the end a stepped altar, on the legs tree-pattern; along the edge a triangle frieze. 0.315 m. \times 0.187 m. \times 0.145 m. high. Standing in position in room 2 of House A.

MN. 29. Terra-cotta, a bearded head only, broken from a statuette, ht. 0.04 m. Pl. X.

MN. 62. Limestone statuette, headless, ht. 0.23 m., Cypriote; a 'temple boy' seated, wearing a short vest with central seam, a bracelet and an anklet; under the rt. hand a bird under the l. a fish (?). Fig. 7 (there wrongly described as from Level 4).

MN. 63. Limestone head of a young man, from a statuette, ht. 0.09 m., Cypriote; wreathed and with a double row of curls over forehead; left side split away.

MN. 64. Fragment of limestone statuette of votary wearing crinkled chiton and himation and carrying a goat under the l. arm; purple paint on the edge of the drapery well preserved. Ht. of fragment, from neck to waist, 0.15 m. Pl. XI.

- MN. 70. Fragment of steatite bowl with central stem and a rosette engraved on the interior.
- MN. 78. Alabastron, Type 1, ht. 0.10 m.
- MN. 87. Terra-cotta head from a statuette, woman; classical style, Rhodian, 5th cent. Ht. 0.38 m. Pl. X.
- MN. 88, 89. Terra-cotta heads, ht. 0.35 m. Pl. X.
- MN. 92. Terra-cotta head, wearing peaked head-dress; Cypriote, crude work; ht. 0.05 m. Pl. X.
- MN. 97. Terra-cotta figurine, fragment of; head of a horse (?). Pl. X.
- MN. 106. Circular loom-weight (?) of clay, baked, bearing the imprint of an oval intaglio, a nude man standing with head turned to rt.
- MN. 107. Fragments of a terra-cotta mask of a woman wearing a veil; Rhodian, late 5th cent.
- MN. 108. Terra-cotta statuette, headless, of a woman standing, draped, the rt. hand at the side, the l. forearm raised in front of the body. Rhodian, 5th cent. style. Pl. XI.
- MN. 159. Beads; a quantity of blue glass double conoids, found together.
- MN. 160. Beads; cylinders of buff paste and large blue glass balls; found together.
- MN. 161. Beads; glass double conoids, found together; apparently clear glass.
- MN. 162. Beads; yellow glass paste balls.
- MN. 163-4. Beads; balls of variegated 'Phoenician' glass.
- MN. 187. Gold ear-ring, lunate type, plain.
- MN. 198. Bone dice.
- MN. 204. Bone pin with turned top, l. 0.125 m.
- MN. 207. Bone statuette, ht. 0.12 m., of a standing woman wearing a polos with curving sides and a long robe girdled at the waist and falling in straight pleats; the body is rigidly columnar; the hands grasp the breasts from beneath; the hair falls down the back in straight plaits, with oblique grooving. The figure is Ionian (? Samian) of about 560-550 B.C.; it is therefore out of its horizon in Level 3. Pl. XIII.
- MN. 219-222. Bronze arrow-heads, Fig. 25.
- MN. 225. Bronze barbed fish-hook, l. 0.098 m. Fig. 25.
- MN. 229. Bronze object, apparently a fastening for furniture, l. 0.114 m., Fig. 25.
- MN. 233. Lead figurine of a bearded man wearing a long gown with short sleeves; his arms are widely extended and in the rt. hand he holds a votive object (? a sheep); the legs are imperfect. Ht. 0.07 m. Crude Syrian style.
- MN. 234. Lead figurine of a man, the left arm extended, the rt. drawn up and bent as if boxing; very crude, and the details uncertain. Ht. 0.06 m.
- MN. 237. Bronze lamp, of the 'cocked-hat' type, with two nozzles; l. 0.17 m. Cf. clay examples, Fig. 16. House E.
- MN. 239-240. Bronze fittings for furniture, *v.* Pl. III. Found in room 18 of House A.
- MN. 242-245. Bronze vessels, bowls and mesomphalic phialae, *v.* Fig. 2.
- MN. 247-251. Bronze ladles with long handles bent back and ending in ducks' heads; l. *circ.* 0.35 m.; of the last two only the handles are preserved.
- MN. 252. Bronze ring, diam. 0.05 m., from which rises the head of a bird; use doubtful.
- MN. 253. Bronze torque with ram's head terminals; diam. 0.13 m.
- MN. 261. Bronze mirror-case, with moulded sides; diam. 0.10 m.
- MN. 268, 269, 272. Masses of very slender bronze rods or spines, l. 0.065 m. or 0.055 m., straight but with one end turned over in a half-loop, which had been set or fastened in bundles and are now joined by oxydisation; they might be the bristles of wire brushes, originally set in some substance which has disappeared, used possibly for teasing cloth; or they may have been used separately and were merely tied in bundles for convenience.
- MN. 270. Bronze bell, ht. 0.07 m. Cf. Fig. 28, MNN. 34.
- MN. 271. Bronze bodkins or knitting-needles, varying in length up to 0.21 m.; numbers found in Level 3.
- MN. 274. Bronze tweezers, l. 0.071 m., one end plain, the other toothed.
- MN. 276. Bronze pin, l. 0.07 m., the top coiled and ending in a snake's head.
- MN. 280. Bronze fish-hook, barbed; the haft flattened at the tip; l. 0.02 m.
- MN. 285-291. Bronze fibulae, types as Fig. 17, nos. 2, 4, 7 and 8.

- MN. 292-295. Bronze arrow-heads, types A 3, A 4, A 5, A 6, Fig. 25.
 MN. 305. Iron bill-hook, l. 0.039 m.
 MN. 307. Iron double axe, l. 0.135 m.
 MN. 308. Iron chisel, l. 0.026 m.
 MN. 311. Iron double axe, l. 0.22 m.
 MN. 323. Iron fibulae, all rather large examples of type 8, Fig. 17. Found together.
 MN. 328. Iron knife-blade, l. 0.10 m.
 MN. 329. Iron tool with axe and adze blades, l. 0.19 m. House A, room 15.
 MN. 330. Iron pick-head, l. 0.20 m.
 MN. 331. Iron pick-head, l. 0.16 m.
 MN. 332. Iron knife with curved blade and ball pommel, l. 0.20 m.
 MN. 333. Iron knife-blade, l. 0.175 m.
 MN. 344. Necklace of gold and silver beads, Fig. 9. The silver beads are double-threaded, formed of two rings to which is affixed a disk enriched with beads and filigree; the gold pendants are of a light greenish-yellow colour, but are of 18 ct. gold⁸ throughout and consist of double conoids with disk attachments enriched with central studs and filigree. cable borders or cylindrical beads with filigree cable ends, as well as semicircular serrated beads from which hang long leaf-shaped pendants. With the necklace were found a sard intaglio, a hoard of 43 coins, on which see E. S. G. Robinson in *Num. Chron.* xvii, p. 1, and the objects MN. 345, 347 and some fragments of bronze perhaps from a casket. House E, room 2.
 MN. 345. Silver bracelet in the form of a serpent, found with MN. 344.
 MN. 347. Lead ingots; narrow strips of flat metal often bent in two; found in room 2 of House E.
 MN. 394. Copper scale-pans, slightly concave, diam. 0.125 m. From room 2, House G, found with a jar containing dried raisins. Also a third scale-pan (MN. 395).
 MN. 396. Piece of bronze scale armour, rounded below, with holes for attachment at the top corners; l. 0.06 m., width 0.035 m. From room 2, House G.
 MN. 397. Copper jug, ht. 0.19 m., Fig. 18. From room 2, House G.
 MN. 398. Copper ladle with handle ending in a duck's head. L. 0.32 m. From room 2, House G.
 MN. 399. Copper ladle, as MN. 398, found with it. House G, room 2.
 MN. 421. Silver purse; situla-shaped, ht. 0.067 m., diam. 0.025 m. Below the rim is a chevron in coarse granulated work; there are two ring handles descending in lily attachment and a domical lid with suspension-ring. Pl. XIII. In it 54 silver coins, 2 sixteenth-shekel and a thirty-second shekel of Sidon and an obol, 48 eighth obols and 2 sixteenth obols of Aradus; v. E. S. G. Robinson in the *Num. Chron.*, fifth series, xvii, p. 3.
 MN. 425. Terra-cotta relief, head from; head wearing a polos, Cypriote style, ht. 0.06 m. Pl. X.
 MNN. 23. Bone spoon, with flat bowl; l. 0.125 m. Fig. 25, Pl. XIII.
 MNN. 24. Bronze spoon with round flat bowl; l. 0.11 m. Fig. 25.
 MNN. 26. Bronze strigil-blade, l. 0.095 m., in bad condition.
 MNN. 34. Bronze bell, hemispherical, with iron clapper; diam. 0.03 m. Fig. 25.
 MNN. 41. Clay amphora-handle with stamp. Fig. 20.
 MNN. 46. Fragment of a statuette in marble, grey with fine crystalline grain; woman, wearing chiton and himation, standing, with the weight on the left foot, right knee bent; only the legs from the knees downwards preserved. Ht. 0.10 m. Pl. XII.
 MNN. 48. Fragment of marble slab with remains of inscription; letters 0.035 m. high. Fig. 20.
 MNN. 50. Bronze handle for a vessel in the form of a duck's head bent forward so that the beak touches the breast, which is treated in shell fashion. Ht. 0.05 m. Fig. 22.

⁸ I am indebted for the analysis to Mr. James R. Ogden, F.S.A., who found that the beads can be brought by a very simple treatment to a bright gold colour which he believes to be original—an opinion challenged by Mr. H. A. P. Littledale. Mr. Ogden on seeing the necklace recognised the quality of the gold alloy and suggested that the light colour which

seemed inconsistent with 18 ct. metal was due to the effects of heat, not knowing that the object had been found in the burnt ruins of the house. Mr. Littledale holds that the pitted surface of the cleaned and burnished beads, as shewn by microphotographs, implies the disappearance of an element in the alloy which was responsible for the original pale colouring.

MNN. 52. Three bronze arrow-heads, types A 5, A 8, A 9. Fig. 25.

MNN. 79. Bone appliqué ornament with elaborate palmette pattern carved in low relief; ht. 0.076 m. Pl. XIII.

MNN. 96. Copper kohl-stick, l. 0.135 m. Fig. 25.

MNN. 101. Bronze mirror, plain, diam. 0.124 m.

MNN. 115. Terra-cotta figurine, ht. 0.075 m., of a nude male figure squat and fat (Harpokrates?), standing with hands over stomach; the head is clean-shaven. Hands and legs missing. There are traces of red paint over the whole body. Fig. 21, Pl. XI.

MNN. 129. Bronze lid (?) circular, with raised handles and dot border and belt of egg-and-tongue pattern round the edge. Diam. 0.075 m. Fig. 22.

MNN. 141. Copper scale-pans, diam. 0.075 m.

MNN. 148. Terra-cotta statuette, upper part of; a woman wearing a heavy cloak and nursing an infant; she wears a diadem and necklace and her hair is elaborately curled. The side of the cloak and all the body below the waist missing. Ht. 0.07 m. Pl. XI.

MNN. 149. Terra-cotta relief of a nude youth standing beside an altar; the head and top of relief missing; the left arm is extended and a cloak hangs from it, the right hand grasps a bottle (?) which rests on the altar. Ht. 0.105 m. Pl. XI.

MNN. 150. Terra-cotta figurine, fragment of. A youthful male figure, head and legs missing; a mantle draped over the left shoulder and held by the left hand crosses the belly; the torso is bare; the right arm hangs by the side. Ht. 0.08 m. Traces of white slip over the figure; soft dull orange clay. Fourth century work. Pl. XI.

The weights found in this level were MN. 23 (8), MN. 262, MN. 299, MN. 401 (4), MNN. 125, MNN. 126, MNN. 127 (2), MNN. 128 (3).

Level 4.

The following are the more important objects found in Level 4:

MN. 33. Large flat pan, perhaps a mirror-back, circular, with a wide tang doubled over at the sides; the rim is slightly raised. Total l. 0.375 m.

MN. 267. Terra-cotta statuette of a squatting boy, ht. 0.06 m.; the type recalls the Cypriote 'temple boy'; crude work, the details indistinct.

MN. 275. Bronze mirror, with tang; diam. 0.115 m.

MN. 284. Bronze ear-ring, ornate form made with narrow strip metal curled in volutes.

MNN. 29. Bone spoon, l. 0.12 m.; Fig. 25.

MNN. 32. Bronze mirror, virtually circular, with long tang; diam. 0.116 m.

MNN. 33. Two bronze spoons, one with round bowl, one with spade-shaped bowl; ll. 0.10 m. and 0.075 m. Fig. 25.

MNN. 42. Bronze fibula of type 8, Fig. 17.

MNN. 47. Silver bracelet; a band of metal 0.05 m. wide, the surface corrugated and the ends decorated with bold volutes and palmettes; Fig. 23.

MNN. 72. Arrow-heads (4), bronze, with solid triangular heads, l. 0.063 m. Type A 8.

MNN. 76. Bone kohl-tube, l. 0.115 m., diam. 0.027 m.; lathe-turned in simple ridges; the base missing.

MNN. 78. Limestone head of a woman, ht. 0.06 m., in Cypriote style, shewing traces of red paint on necklace, kerchief, eyes and mouth. From Sq. K 9. Pl. XII.

MNN. 86. Fragment of a bone figure; part of the left side of the body, from shoulder to waist; it has been split down the middle and the head and legs broken away. The figure had elaborately dressed hair and a heavy cloak enveloping all the body and the upper arm; the left arm hangs by the side and the hand grasps the skirt. Total ht. 0.055 m. The figure seems to be of Ionian (?Rhodian) work and should be earlier than the stratum in which it was found, described in the field notes as Level 4-5. At this point (Sq. K 10) the strata were much disturbed. Pl. XIII.

MNN. 94. Copper scale-pan, diam. 0.063 m. Sq. A 2.

MNN. 97. Head from a terra-cotta figurine; woman's head with hair braided over forehead; once covered with white slip and painted. Pl. XI. Sq. L 10.

MNN. 102. Alabaster situla, ht. 0.08 m. Type 3, Fig. 19.

MNN. 130. Limestone head, Cypriote, of Egyptianising type, ht. 0.07 m.; the hair is worn in the *klepht*, and there are heavy ornaments in the ears. Pl. XII. House B, room 7.

MNN. 159. Torso, limestone, of Herakles (?); male figure wearing a chiton (painted red) and a lion's skin with two paws slung forwards over the shoulders and two knotted at the breast. Belt painted red, hair blue. Cypriote. Pl. XII.

MN. 196. Four fragments of bone inlay, pattern of foliage; greatest l. 0.033 m.

MN. 197. Miniature herm carved in bone; two bearded Oriental heads back to back. Ht. 0.03 m.

MN. 198. Five dice, bone, from Levels 3 and 4.

MN. 327. Iron knife-blade, leaf-shaped with curved edge, l. 0.158 m.

Level 5.

The following are the more important objects found in this level:

MN. 32. Terra-cotta relief, upper part of a moulded plaque in high relief; a woman, wearing cap, veil and necklace, full front, holding her breasts. Babylonian style. Ht. 0.06 m. Pl. X.

MN. 41. Bronze figurine of a cock, length 0.03 m.; the legs missing.

MN. 46. Terra-cotta head, moulded in the round, made with a plug for insertion in the body. Woman's head, the features much rubbed, Cypriote, Egyptianising style of *circ.* 540 B.C. Ht. 0.62 m. Fig. 6.

MN. 61. Limestone base of archaic statuette. Preserved are two nude human feet and between them the forepaws of an animal; probably Heracles holding the lion upside down in front of him. This is not a Cypriote type (nor does the limestone seem to be Cypriote) but probably Naukratite. L. 0.06 m.

MN. 90. Terra-cotta head moulded in the round; woman's head wearing a fringed wig; Cypriote, Egyptianising style. Ht. 0.62 m. Fig. 6.

MN. 91. Terra-cotta head, moulded in the round; male, apparently derived from an Ionic Apollo type. Ht. 0.04 m. Fig. 6.

MN. 98. Terra-cotta head of horse; l. 0.05 m. Pl. X.

MN. 114. Fragments, in very bad condition, of an aryballos of glazed frit decorated with a rosette in relief covering most of the body.

MN. 184. Silver finger-ring. The hoop composed of 4 twisted wires soldered together, flat; three knobs at the shoulders; the bezel rounded with interior rosette originally inlaid with paste (?).

MN. 185. Silver finger-ring. Plain hoop circular in section with a large knob at the shoulder; swivel bezel of gold, a plain border with two rings of twisted wire; inset, a blue paste scarab.

MN. 195. Bone inlay, shield-shaped, the inside cut away to take a secondary inlay; l. 0.047 m. Fig. 25. Precisely similar pieces come from Mesopotamia at all dates; they were set closely together to make an imbricated pattern. Inlaid objects of this sort served as the model for Protocorinthian vase-painters.

MN. 369. Terra-cotta figurine, upper half of; moulded figure of a woman holding two cups before her right shoulder. Cypriote, Egyptianising style of the middle of the 6th century. Ht. 0.14 m. Fig. 6.

MN. 370. Terra-cotta figurine, moulded in the round; a man (preserved from neck to waist) wearing short-sleeved tunic, jerkin cut away in front, belt and kilt, holding a ram before his breast. Ht. 0.12 m. Cypriote, middle of the 6th century. Pl. XI.

MN. 393. Copper saucepan-lid (?); circular, with raised centre and long handle ending in a ring. Diam. 0.105 m., l. 0.23 m.

MN. 419. Bone die, *circ.* 0.012 m. cube. On two opposite faces the number 3 is repeated, the other four faces are blank; unfinished (?).

MN. 427. Bronze blade with tang ending in a button, shaped like a spear-blade but with blunt edges. L. 0.22 m.

MN. 429. Iron blade, chisel (?), with short tang; l. 0.085 m., width 0.035 m.

MN. 430. Iron lance-head, narrow leaf-shaped with short tang. L. 0.11 m., width 0.02 m.

MNN. 151. Terra-cotta head, moulded; male head wearing high Phrygian cap. Local or Cypriote fabric. Ht. 0.063 m. Pl. XI.

MNN. 158. Miniature stone celt, l. 0.018 m.

MNN. 165. Terra-cotta figurine, crudely hand-modelled, of a camel; the rider is missing. Ht. 0.10 m.

Level 6.

MN. 47. Bronze fibula, arched and ringed, Eastern Greek Iron Age type, l. 0.043 m. Three others, smaller, of the same type, came from the same level. Level 6. Fig. 17, No. 2.

MN. 48. Bronze arrow-head, leaf-shaped with hollow socket and central rib; Type A 3; l. 0.043 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 52. Object in blue-glazed frit; a tapered object 0.175 m. long, oblong in section, having down the front a central groove on either side of which are oblique strokes; at the wider end are remains of a concave curve. It might be the handle of a mirror (?), but also resembles a 'false beard' such as might be attached to a composite statue.

MN. 53. Bronze fibula; the pin is missing; the bow is a flattened arch, close to each end is a fluted bead and between these the metal is flattened into an oblong plate whereon is a lozenge in relief. Length 0.078 m.; broken.

MN. 100. Terra-cotta figurine, hand modelled, of a dog; ht. 0.05 m. Pl. X.

MN. 122. Fragment of a steatite mould; a central channel with volutes at the top. Ht. 0.037 m.

MN. 371. Terra-cotta head, made separately, from a figurine; male, with hair done in Egyptian style; poor flaccid work; Cypriote. Ht. 0.06 m.

MN. 372. Terra-cotta head from a female figurine; Cypriote style with the hair brought down in long tresses over the shoulders in applied technique; originally painted red. Ht. 0.05 m. Fig. 6.

MNN. 152. Bronze figurine, cast in the round, of a seated man, apparently nude, with the arms raised in front of the chest. Crude work. Ht. 0.06 m. Level 6-7. Pl. XIV.

MNN. 157. A set of carnelian beads, small rings and date-shaped, with two large agate date-shaped and three silver pendants. Two of these were leaf-shaped plaques whereon in repoussé work a nude female figure, full face; the central pendant was larger and nearly rectangular with an uncertain subject in relief; all were in very bad condition. They were found under the foundations of a wall of Level 5 in Sq. G 4.

Level 8.

MN. 110. Fragment from a terra-cotta figure or vase in the form of a human figure. Preserved are only the left shoulder with left biceps, left breast, draped, and right hand and wrist, the hand laid on the left shoulder. The clay is remarkably fine with rich pink surface whereon are lines of brown paint; the finger-nails are white. Ht. 0.044 m. Pl. X. It is a most unusual piece, bearing a certain resemblance to the Egyptian anthropomorphic vases of the 18th dynasty, but the clay is different; probably it should be called Ionian.

MN. 112. Two fragments of a faience vase with black ground, whereon white bands and circles.

MN. 113. Fragments of a vase of alabastron form in faience, with white bands on a sandy-yellow ground.

MN. 218. Bronze mirror, with tang, plain. Total l. 0.146 m.

MN. 224. Bronze razor, l. 0.153 m. Fig. 25.

MN. 322. Bronze pendant signet; oval bezel on a swivel pendant from a link; l. 0.022 m.

MN. 359. Slate mould for jewellery; rings and dotted crescents, drop ear-rings composed of four balls, triangular pendants, etc. L. 0.10 m.

MN. 365. Bow of a bronze fibula with flattened plate on which incised pattern; l. 0.075 m.

MN. 426. Terra-cotta figurine, Cypriote, hand-modelled, of a bearded man standing with outstretched arms; the beard and eyes are painted black and there are black transverse marks on the right arm; the skull-cap and loin-cloth are red and there is a red stripe over the rt. shoulder; over the left shoulder is an applied bandeau whereon red markings. One arm and one leg missing; ht. 0.125 m. Found below the foundations of a Level 7 wall. Pl. XI.

MN. 416. Fragments of an object in green-glazed frit, apparently an Egyptian boomerang-shaped 'magic' wand; greatest l. 0.095 m., width 0.045 m.

MN. 163. Gold pendant (the loop missing), ht. 0.012 m. From Level 7-8.

The full importance of the results obtained by the excavation of al Mina can be estimated only when the articles dealing with the pottery, etc., have been published, and I should wish here to emphasise my gratitude to the scholars who have undertaken that work.⁹ Much of the architectural and archaeological detail which I have given above is of value only for its bearing on the pottery associated with the buildings; while the house remains in most of the strata are too scanty to boast much interest in themselves, the sequence of stratification as applied to the imported wares gives a record of contacts between East and West which is singularly complete. I stated on p. 5 that the entire costs of the initial season and about half those of the season 1937 were defrayed by private subscribers. I was personally indebted to them for financing what was admittedly an experiment, but now that the work is shewn to have made a real contribution to classical knowledge the debt is more widespread and should be properly recognised. The total amount raised in those two years was £3620; the list of subscribers was as follows:

F. R. S. Balfour, Esq.; A. E. Bond, Esq.; Cedric R. Boulton, Esq.; the Rt. Hon. the Countess Buxton; A. E. Buxton, Esq.; Alfred Clark, Esq.; Miss R. Chichester; Miss M. Cropper; Sir Percival David, Bart.; T. P. Denman, Esq.; George Eumorfopoulos, Esq.; Sir Arthur Evans; Mrs. Gerstley; Miss A. Hirst; C. H. St. John Hornby, Esq.; J. Spedan Lewis, Esq.; E. Lister, Esq.; W. E. F. Macmillan, Esq.; Sir D. O. Malcolm; Major-General Sir Neill Malcolm; Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Bart.; Miss Constance I. Meade; P. A. Molteno, Esq.; J. R. Ogden, Esq.; H. J. Oppenheim, Esq.; Oscar Raphael, Esq.; A. L. Reckitt, Esq.; Miss E. Reddan; Miss M. Reddan; Mr. and Mrs. Walter Sedgwick; A. J. Hugh Smith, Esq.; Owen Hugh Smith, Esq.; J. W. Wheeler-Bennett, Esq.; to these should be added the British School of Archaeology in Iraq, and the Oxford Colleges, whose contributions swelled that of the Ashmolean Museum.

LEONARD WOOLLEY.

London.

⁹ Mr. E. A. Lane's article, *Mediaeval Finds at al Mina in North Syria*, appears in *Archaeologia*, lxxxvii, p. 20. The articles on the Attic red-

figured pottery by Professor Beazley and on the earlier pottery by Mr. C. M. Robertson, will appear in the next volume of the *JHS*.

NOTES ON THE ATHENIAN ΓΕΝΗ

ANCIENT authorities agree in placing the division of the people into tribes, phratries and gene among the most primitive institutions of Athens. The question presents itself, Were all the citizens enrolled in all of these organisations, or were some sections of the people excluded from any or all of them? On the answer given to this question depends to some extent the view to be taken of the origin of this triple classification.

The prevailing opinion is that, whereas tribes and phratries embraced the whole citizen-body, the gene were the exclusive organisation of the nobles. M. Cary¹ adduces a fragment of early Attic law² to prove that the phratries contained others besides gennetai (I shall deal later with this text) and asserts, in the face of the explicit testimony of Aristotle³ and the lexicographers, that the genos was not a subdivision of the phratry. I can find absolutely no support in the texts for this view. Most modern authorities are so completely convinced of the aristocratic nature of the genos that they do not even try to prove it.⁴ Francotte⁵ says simply: 'D'abord, les genê sont des institutions aristocratiques. Je ne crois pas qu'il soit nécessaire d'insister.' Beloch refers to the 'gene—d.h. der Adelsgeschlechter.' De Sanctis⁶ takes the same view; he discounts altogether the ancient authorities and remarks, somewhat naïvely,—'È altresi singolare che l'autore di quello schema ignori come gran parte della popolazione cittadina in Atene non era compresa nelle genti.' It would, indeed, be remarkable that an author of the fourth century B.C., in possession of far more evidence than is at the disposal of the modern scholar, should go so grievously astray as De Sanctis' account supposes him to have done. Toepffer⁷ forestalls all future discussion of the problem with the dictum: 'Die eine unbestreitbare Thatsache ist, dass keineswegs alle athenischen Staatsbürger γεννῆται, d.h. Mitglieder irgendeines der staatlich anerkannten Geschlechtsverbände gewesen sind.'

What have the ancient authorities to say on the subject? Aristotle, who is followed by the lexicographers Harpocration, Photius, Pollux and Suidas, states that the whole population was originally divided into four tribes, each tribe into three phratries and each phratry into thirty gene of thirty members each. The mathematical precision and symmetry of these

¹ CAH III, 584.

² Philochorus ap. Photium, 344.

³ Schol. Plat. *Axiach.*, 371D, p. 465.

⁴ An important exception is H. T. Wade-Gery *Eupatridai, Archons and Areopagus* and *Studies in the Structure of Attic Society* in CQ 25, 1931). In support of the view that the gene were not exclusively aristocratic organisations, he quotes—unanswerably as it seems to me—the statement of Polemon (schol-

Soph. *O.C.* 489) that 'the Gennetai of the Genos Hesyichidai performed a certain sacrifice in which no Eupatridai took part.' He does not, however, 'take for granted Aristotle's theory that the Gennetai had once composed the whole nation.'

⁵ *La Polis Grecque*, p. 11.

⁶ *Atthis*, p. 59.

⁷ *Attische Genealogie*, p. 2.

figures have led most modern writers to reject the entire testimony of the passage. Part of it can, however, be checked. We do know the names of the four tribes, of a few of the phratries and of some ninety gene. It is not intrinsically unlikely, as Cary and Francotte admit, that the total number of gene did amount to something like 360. But how, then, account for the number of thirty members which Aristotle ascribes to each clan? Beloch⁸ places the upper limit of the possible citizen population of Athens in Cleisthenes' day at 30,000, and it may well have been considerably less.⁹ The constitutional reform of Cleisthenes, besides putting an end to tribe, phratry and genos as active organs of State, admitted great numbers of foreigners and slaves to the Athenian franchise.¹⁰ It is at least possible that the number of citizens immediately before Cleisthenes' reform of the State was approximately 10,000, and that Aristotle obtained his figure of thirty members per genos by dividing the total population by the number of gene. This seems to me a more likely explanation than to suppose that Aristotle simply constructed his figures out of nothing. In Aristotle's day, the relation between genos and phratry was not that which he describes as the original one. In the fourth century B.C. the phratry did contain others besides gennetai, and if Aristotle describes the phratry as originally divided into gene and containing only genos-members, then one naturally supposes that he had evidence of a revolution in the kinship system of which no explicit mention has survived. This revolution must have occurred at a comparatively recent period—recent enough, that is, for evidence of it to have survived till Aristotle's time. As I have already suggested, and as I hope to show later, the reform of the constitution by Cleisthenes is the most suitable event to which to refer this transformation in the Athenian kinship-organisation.

There is other evidence, apart from the direct statements of Aristotle and the lexicographers, that originally the gene included all the citizens. An early law quoted in Aristotle¹¹ states: ἐάν [τιν]ες τυραννεῖν ἐπανίστω[ν]ται [[ἐπὶ τυραννίδι]] ἢ τὴν τυραννίδα τις συγκαθιστῇ. ἄτιμος[ν] εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος. The terms of this law presuppose that the offending citizen will belong to a genos. It may be objected that the word γένος is here used in the general sense of 'relations, kin'; but legal documents must in the nature of things be more precise in their language than such an interpretation would allow. Early Attic law is accurate in its definitions of degrees of kinship, as, for instance, Draco's law on homicide shows. Furthermore, there is the case of Alcmaeonid genos, the whole of which was involved in the 'curse of Cylon,' to demonstrate that the crime of one individual might involve in his condemnation all the other members of his genos.¹² The

⁸ *Griech. Gesch.*, I, 1, p. 280, note 2.

⁹ Herodotus (V, 97) mentions 30,000 as the number of citizens in 500 B.C., but may be exaggerating somewhat for the sake of effect.

¹⁰ Aristotle, *Pol.* 3, 1, 10, 1273b, cf. *Ath. Pol.* 21.

¹¹ *Ath. Pol.* 16.

¹² H. T. Wade-Gery (*Eupatridai, Archons and Areopagus*, loc. cit.) considers that the Alcmaeonidae were not a genos, but an *oikia*, a more restricted unit than

the genos. The direct evidence against this view is that of Pausanias II, 18, 9 and of Hesychius and Suidas (surely the words: Ἀλκμεωνίδαι: ἀπὸ Ἀλκμέωνος τοῦ κατὰ Θησέα mean 'Alcmaeonidae: from the Alcmaeon contemporary with Theseus'). His argument is that the Alcmaeonidae, being few enough to share in the wealth given to Alcmaeon by Croesus and to Megacles II by Cleisthenes of Sicyon, and also to be involved in the curse of Cylon, must have been too

only natural conclusion, then, appears to be that at this period all Athenian citizens were genos-members.

Again—and this is perhaps the most cogent argument of all—in none of the ancient accounts of the civil strife at Athens during the sixth century B.C. is it once hinted that the gennetai and the oligarchs were the same faction. Indeed, the gennetai are not mentioned by Solon, Herodotus, Aristotle or Plutarch as being opposed to the demos.¹³ Surely if this had been the case some mention of the fact must have been made by the writers who dealt with the subject.¹⁴

At Athens, then, as at Kalymna,¹⁵ Olymos¹⁶ and Thasos,¹⁷ the gene originally embraced not merely a section of the population, but the entire citizen-body.¹⁸ And this is what analogies drawn from other primitive societies would lead one to expect.

The primary social unit of primitive peoples is, according to the Durkheim school of sociology, the totemic clan. This may break up into secondary clans, and then stands to them as phratry to genos in Aristotle's account of the Athenian institutions. Originally the union between clan-members is not merely blood-relationship, but mystic union with the

few in number to constitute a genos. It is indisputable that the Alcmaeonidae who play a great part in history are members of a single *clikia* (see Hdt. VI, 125); but this is no reason to reject the testimony of the ancient authorities who state that there did exist an Alcmaeonid genos. I believe that the prominence of this particular family within the genos was largely due to the wealth acquired by its members at Sardis and Sicyon; the words applied to Pericles by Plutarch (*Vit. Per.* 3)—*ἦν --- οἴκου δὲ καὶ γένους τοῦ πρώτου κατ' ἀμφοτέρους* show that gene in general, and the Alcmaeonid genos in particular, did contain more and less distinguished families. As to the curse of Cylon, if it could be suggested, 200 years after, that it was still operative (against Pericles), and if it was made retroactive to include the buried ancestors of the Alcmaeonidae, it does not seem unlikely that it should have included the gennetai contemporary with Megacles the archon. The curse, incidentally, probably accounts for the solidarity of the Alcmaeonid genos in later times, when for most of the Athenian citizens the genos had ceased to mean much. Cp. W. S. Ferguson in *Hesperia*, VII, p. 43. n. 3.

¹³ Nobody would maintain that Themistocles was a member of the aristocracy—*πατρὸς γὰρ ἦν Νεοκλέους οὐ τῶν ἀγαν ἐπιφανῶν Ἀθήνησι* (Plutarch, *Vit. Them.* I)—but *ὅτι μέντοι τοῦ Λυκομιδῶν γένους μετείχε δῆλός ἐστι* (*ibid.*).

¹⁴ Why, then, have almost all historians taken for granted that only the 'nobility' of Athens could boast of membership in the gene? The reason is partly to be found in a disregard of development in time of the organisations under discussion, and partly in analogies, conscious or not, with mediaeval Europe. There, certainly, only the nobles were able to trace descent back over several generations;

but we have no proof that the cause which led them to do so—the need to establish their place in the feudal system and their hereditary right to exploit land and serfs—ever did exist in Greece. Attica at any rate never knew a feudal system; and those who have assumed that only the Athenian aristocrats could trace their descent from a remote ancestor never seem to have asked themselves why these 'nobles' should have bothered to do so.

¹⁵ Newton, *Anc. Gk. Inscr.* II, 238.

¹⁶ Lebas-Wad. *Voy. Arch.* 334.

¹⁷ *IG.* XII. 8, 267.

¹⁸ In his treatment of the problem of the origins of the Athenian gene, E. Meyer is less satisfactory than usual. He admits (*Gesch. des. Alt.* III. 278) that it is the fixation of a people to the soil and the rise of property in land that produce economic, and hence social and political, inequality. Again, it was inequality of property which led to the rise of an aristocracy (p. 279). He accepts the view that at a later date the gene included the whole citizen-body, but insists that the genos was originally a purely aristocratic organisation (p. 283). The question which must be answered is, How, then, did the rest of the citizens win a place inside the gene? And the answer is astonishing: it was the settling down of the people which caused the extension of the genos-system in the whole population (p. 286). Why? Apparently the very fact which, by producing economic inequality, led to the creation of an aristocracy with an exclusive clan-system, induced the aristocrats to abandon their exclusiveness and to share with the despised commoners that which was the hallmark of their privileges (das Kennzeichen des Adels—p. 283). To me, this does not seem to make sense.

totem; this, however, is transmitted from parents to children, and later, as the totemic idea fades, becomes indistinguishable from simple blood-relationship. Membership of the clan is normally acquired by blood-descent, but may be conferred on strangers by the process of adoption, or may even be imposed by force. The clan has its own rules of conduct, of which the most important are: to avenge wrongs done to any member, to participate in the clan cult, to marry out of the clan and to abstain from eating the totem animal.¹⁹

What is known of early Athenian institutions presents striking affinities with the totemic system. Even the totem itself is perhaps still discernible. G. Davy²⁰ remarks that the head of the clan 'a le droit de revendiquer l'emblème totémique: aussi le fait-il figurer sur son blason, tant et si bien qu'on va finir par considérer que le totem du groupe c'est le blason du chef.' We know of the existence of coats-of-arms which served as the emblems of particular Athenian clans—the triskeles of the Alcmaeonids, the bull's head of the Eteobutadae, and others, beetle, horse, astragalos, panther's head, which cannot be assigned to any particular gene.²¹ What was the origin of these emblems? There is no 'natural' tendency of warriors to carry emblems on their shields, any more than to seek to trace their ancestry, and the origin of these Athenian escutcheons has not, to my knowledge, ever been explained satisfactorily. It is at least possible that they are the old totems, although now diminished in importance and probably void of any religious significance beyond an apotropaic one.

By rejecting this explanation of the origin of tribe, phratry and genos, one is forced to regard one or all of them as completely artificial agglomerations of families, and to condemn as worthless the genealogies which they possessed.^{21a} It is argued (as *e.g.* by Cary²²) that 'the artificial character of the clans . . . is also indicated by the longevity of several clans which maintained an unbroken existence to the days of the Roman Empire,' and hence that such 'family trees' as existed must have been forgeries. But parallels drawn from other primitive cultures show that it is perfectly possible for trustworthy records to be preserved when every member of the community is familiar with them. The social organisation of the New Zealand Maoris presents affinities with the Greek: the largest unit is the tribe (*iwi*), claiming descent from one ancestor; it comprises several '*hapu*,' and these are divided either into *sub-hapu* or immediately into households (*whanau*), which may each contain several families. These Maori tribes can trace their descent back over several centuries, although writing was unknown to them before the coming of the Europeans. 'The Ngati-Tuwharatoa tribe, for instance, are descended from the Tuwharatoa

¹⁹ For all this see G. Davy, *Des Clans aux Empires*.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

²¹ See Seltman, *Athens, its History and Coinage*.

^{21a} W. S. Ferguson (*op. cit.* p. 24) asserts the complete artificiality of the genos, but quotes in support of his view only the late authorities Harpocration, Pollux and the *Etym. Mag.* While admitting the possible value of such authorities on points of fact, I distrust very much their attempts at explanation of

the origins of institutions, such explanation being largely based merely on deductions from the contemporary condition of these institutions. The use of the comparative method has, I believe, given us a truer notion of the nature and origin (though not, of course, of the details) of the ancient social units than the Greeks of the Classical and post-Classical eras had.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 585.

who lived . . . about 300 years ago. . . . The Tapuika tribe take their title from an ancestor of that name who is calculated to have lived about the latter half of the fourteenth century.' ²³ The original home of the Maoris was in Tahiti and Rarotonga, and comparison of the genealogical lines of native tribes there, as well as in all parts of New Zealand, has established the date of the Maori migration at roughly A.D. 1350. It would seem, then, that on this point there is no intrinsic unlikelihood in the traditions of the Athenian phratries and gene. Another indication of their genuineness is the obscurity, remarked by Toepffer, of the traditional ancestors of the phratries and gene, about most of whom nothing at all is known. Surely if the 'family trees' had been invented at a late date, the compilers would have chosen famous figures of legend to grace the beginnings of their line.²⁴

My conclusion is, then, that *genos*, phratry and tribe were not artificial agglomerations of families, but, as etymology, supported by Athenian tradition, suggests, natural units based substantially on actual kinship ties. Kinship is the cement which knits together primitive communities which have not long outpassed the nomad stage and in which no great differences in property have as yet arisen. In a society where all members are akin, the stranger can have no recognised place, no right to live. The only means of reconciling family law and the wider exigencies of hospitality and humanity is through adoption, and adoption, as Lécrivain ²⁵ points out, was probably one of the most ancient of Greek institutions. Up to a late period even slaves were formally adopted into the family by the ceremony of *καταχύσματα*, and at death were buried in the master's tomb. The law of Gortyna ²⁶ gave slaves under certain conditions the right of inheritance of their master's property.

The kinship institutions break down when the people abandons nomadism for agriculture, and the resultant divergences in wealth gradually lead to the fragmentation of phratry and clan and to the disappearance of the old solidarity between their members.²⁷ The ultimate result is the concentration of wealth (and consequently of political power) in the hands of a few clans and families, whose sectional interests lead them to unite into a closed aristocracy. Plutarch records that Theseus 'first divided the people into Eupatridai, Geomoroi and Demiourgoi,' and although, as De Sanctis ²⁸ points out, these three classes appear in action only once in Athenian history, in the troubled period which followed the reforms of Solon, it is probable that this division is much older. At all events, ancient tradition was agreed that between the period of the kings and the democracy Athens was ruled by an oligarchy. It is with this oligarchy that most authorities relate the *genos*-system ²⁹ (a strange oligarchy, which had room for 360 clans!), making *γεννήτης* a doublet of *εὐπατρίδης*. But the oligarchy, so

²³ R. Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*.

²⁴ Not, of course, that this precludes retouchings of and additions to a genealogy in particular cases (see E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, III. 284).

²⁵ Art. *Genos* in Darem.-Sag.

²⁶ V, 26-8.

²⁷ Cf. Glotz, *Solidarité de la Famille*, p. 17.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 266.

²⁹ Cf. Glotz, *Histoire Grecque*, Vol. I, p. 406.

far from providing the basis for the gene, undermined their position as the basic units of the Athenian political system. For now certain members of the *genos* were included in the narrow circle of the ruling class, while others, the vast majority, were deprived of practically all political rights.³⁰ I believe that all three classes—Eupatrids, Zeugites and Thetes—existed within the framework of the *genos*. The social revolution which led to the displacement of collective ownership within the *genos* by individual ownership will have favoured the growth of the economically strong at the expense of the weak. And the largest landholders in the *genos* were the *genos* chiefs—*βασιλῆες*—whence, I presume, the name Eupatridai applied to the aristocrats.³¹ Thus the *genos* lost most of its political importance, and its place was taken by other organisations (the *ἐταιρεία*,³² not the *genos*, was the characteristic organisation of the aristocrats³³). This, and not the recentness of its origin (as De Sanctis thinks), was the reason for the political insignificance of the *genos* in the sixth century B.C.³⁴

But the development of Greek society in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. had been so rapid that the old ways of thought persisted after the material basis for them had passed away. To Solon civil strife is *στάσις ἔμφυλος*. Society is still thought of as a union of kin. Although the lowest class of citizens in the Solonian constitution has practically no active political rights, nevertheless the Thete is sharply to be distinguished from the metic, who stands outside the body of the kindred. The Thete may, by acquiring wealth, qualify for membership of one of the higher classes, as Anthemion, the son of Diphilos, once a Thete, became a Knight;³⁵ but the metic cannot own land or enjoy any of the rights of citizenship, whatever his wealth in movable property. It is, indeed, asserted³⁶ that Solon granted citizenship to aliens who possessed a trade; but the text in Plutarch³⁷ on which this statement is based says only that he forbade the granting of citizenship to foreigners, except to exiles and to those who had a trade. Voluntary adoption by a clan was a very different matter from the granting of citizen-rights by the central State authority; apart from the adoption of new members by gene, there was at this time no machinery for granting citizenship to aliens; there existed no organisation to receive the new citizens, and Solon did not create it. In his poems he makes no reference to any such revolution in the State system; he is concerned not

³⁰ Incidentally, it was this which wrecked the old equalitarian kinship system, not, as Francotte thinks, the dispersion of members of the same units over the face of Attica. Even after the deme had replaced the *genos* as the basic unit of the State, membership of the deme was hereditary, and members of the same deme did not by any means necessarily inhabit the same district. Athens never developed completely the system of classification by domicile.

³¹ See Glotz (*Hist. Gr.*, p. 128) for the privileges accorded to the *βασιλῆες*.

³² G. Davy, describing the conditions under which social classes arise in a primitive society, says (*op. cit.*, pp. 122 f.), 'Que faut-il faire pour être initié aux rites de la société et posséder par ses esprits, bref,

pour être membre de la confrérie? . . . Ce qu'il faut faire c'est essentiellement acheter ce droit, car il va à la richesse. Et c'est là la grande différence avec le clan, dans lequel on entre par la naissance.'

³³ *Ath. Pol.*, 20.

³⁴ That in other Greek states, too, the *genos* was not an aristocratic cadre is shown by Aristotle's remark on the Cretan constitution (*Pol.* 1272a) οὐκ ἐξ ἀπάντων αἰροῦνται τοὺς, κόσμους ἀλλ' ἐκ τινῶν γενῶν καὶ τοὺς γεροντας ἐκ τῶν κεκοσμηκότων. In Crete, too, the oligarchy did not include all the gene, but embraced only a section of them.

³⁵ *Ath. Pol.*, 7.

³⁶ Bv Adcock in *CAH* IV, 45.

³⁷ *Vit. Sol.*, 24.

with the relations between citizens and non-citizens, but with the problem of the haves and the have-nots within the citizen-body.³⁸

The Athenian constitution in Solon's time was at a transitional stage. The old kinship-organisation had lost its meaning now that the same phratry, the same *genos*, might contain both privileged and virtually disenfranchised citizens, but, largely through religious associations, its forms persisted. Throughout the sixth century the need for a new system of political institutions became ever more obvious. The development of slavery and the growing importance of the merchants, both citizen and *metic*, whose wealth, being derived from commerce, did not entitle them to political privilege under the Solonian constitution, raised problems which could not be settled within the outworn framework. The degrees of citizen-rights had to be defined afresh and a new formula invented to cover the admission of new members into the citizen body. The final solution of the question was not discovered at once. Peisistratus and his sons considerably strengthened the powers of the central State authority at the expense of the individual aristocrats, and allowed many who had no formal title to enjoy the rights of citizenship, but the fall of the tyrants caused the whole question of citizen-rights to be raised afresh.

It is difficult to interpret the party-strife which filled the next few years. Of the two leading figures, Isagoras, we are told, was the representative of the oligarchy, and was responsible for the disenfranchisement of those who had crept illegally into the citizen-rolls under the tyrants. Cleisthenes was the champion of the democracy and of these same 'new-citizens.' Yet Isagoras himself was suspected of being of Carian extraction, and is described as φίλος ὤν τῶν τυράννων,³⁹ which would lead one to expect him to have been of liberal tendencies. However, the Peistratids were perhaps not quite so revolutionary as many authorities suppose them to have been; at any rate, Aristotle says that Peisistratus himself was popular with the aristocracy, and oligarchical leanings on the part of some of his supporters are not surprising. The purification of the citizen-rolls by Isagoras⁴⁰ does not denote concern for the purity of the Athenian stock and attachment to the institution of the *genos* (this would be strange in one not perhaps of pure Athenian extraction), but was simply one way of restricting the number of claimants to political rights, parallel to the division of the citizen-body itself into 'the few' and 'the many.' As for Cleisthenes, as leader of the foremost Athenian clan, he cannot have been opposed to the *genos* as such. He did, however, see the need for a reform amounting to a revolution in the foundations of the political system if Athens were to escape a bitter civil war. Isagoras' policy had alienated not only the mass of the old citizens, who would have been placed in an inferior position to the oligarchs, but also those who had enjoyed citizen-rights under the tyranny,

³⁸ Photius, indeed, says 'Σέλευκος δὲ ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξίωνων ὀργεῶνός φησι καλεῖσθαι τοὺς συνόδους ἔχοντας περὶ τινὰς ἡρώας ἢ θεούς.' The term ὀργεῶνες was applied in later times to those phrators who were not members of *gene*, but this very definition shows that it could be applied in quite

a general manner to members of religious associations, and there is no reason to take it here in that specific sense.

³⁹ *Ath. Pol.*, 20.

⁴⁰ *Hdt.* V, 72.

although not belonging to any *genos* or *phratry*. This powerful following gave Cleisthenes the victory over Isagoras and his Spartan allies, and to him fell the problem of fitting the new citizens into the cadres of the State.⁴¹

Membership of a *phratry* continued to be a necessary qualification for citizenship, and a place had to be found in the *phratries* for the new citizens. To this reform may most plausibly be assigned the law quoted from Philochorus by Pollux—‘τοὺς δὲ φράτορας ἐπάναγκες δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς ὁμογάλακτας οὓς γεννήτας καλοῦμεν.’ The *phratries* therefore contained henceforth two sections: the *ὁμογάλακτες* of the *gene*, and the new citizens, known simply as *orgeones*. That the distinction remained is shown by the following passage from Harpocration: ‘Δημοτελῆ καὶ δημοτικὰ ἔργα διέφερον ἀλλήλων καὶ τῶν ὀργεωνικῶν καὶ τῶν γενικῶν, ὡς Δεῖναρχος δηλοῖ.’ The *orgeones* therefore did not include the *gennetai*.

We find another term applied to *phratry*-members in later times: *thiasos*, *thiasotai*; and it has been concluded that *thiasotes* was a synonym of *orgeon*. But there are serious objections to this view. An inscription of the second century B.C.⁴² records a decree of the *orgeones* of Dionysus to honour Dionysius of Marathon for his services as treasurer of the society. The *Dionysiasts* are referred to as a *thiasos*. It is possible that the terms *orgeones* and *thiasos* are here used in their generic sense and without any reference to the kinship organisation. Harpocration's definitions of these

⁴¹ J. L. Myres (Art. *Cleisthenes in Herodotus*, Mélanges Glotz) seeks to show that in Cleisthenes' day the term *ἐταίρεια* meant something like the early Roman familia—a *genos* with accretions of metics and freedmen under the *προστασία* of the head of the *genos*. He suggests that the mass of foreigners and freedmen who were ultimately given citizen-rights by Cleisthenes had been formally attached in this way to the Peisistratid *genos*; that after the fall of the tyrants Cleisthenes tried to win the now-unattached mass of 'clients' to his *genos*, and that it was only after failing in this that he proceeded to the reform of the constitution.

However, the relation of the Athenian metic to his *προστάτης* was not that of the Roman *cliens* to his *patronus*. The *clientes* were an adjunct of the family taking part in the gentile 'sacra,' and, generally, were in the power of the *paterfamilias*; but there is nothing to show that *προστασία* was anything beyond a temporary relationship between individuals. The relevant texts do not go much farther back than the fourth century, but from them it is clear that at that time the metics did not form groups in close connexion with the *gene*. In general, the State dealt directly with the metic, and protected him in return for the services which he performed to the State: 'Le *prostate* était le citoyen d'un *dème* qui présentait à ce *dème* le nouveau *métèque* et le faisait inscrire sur ses registres, après quoi ses fonctions cessaient, et le *métèque* était en possession de tous ses droits' (M. Clerc, *Metoikoi* in Dar.-Sag.). What the exact legal status of metics was in the sixth century is a

matter for pure conjecture, but nothing in the texts indicates the existence of anything like the Roman *clientela*, an integral part of the patrician familia. There is, then, no reason to suppose that Athens knew any institution corresponding to the Roman familia, or that the term *ἐταίρεια* can bear the meaning which Myres assigns to it.

Furthermore, what produced the civil strife after the close of the tyranny was not merely the ambition of one or two prominent men. It was the threat made by the oligarchs to the civil existence of those who had enjoyed *de facto* citizenship under the tyrants. It was not that Peisistratus had been *προστάτης* in the later, precise sense of the term, of the numerous metics whom his rule had attracted to Athens; he had actually allowed them citizen-rights (which metics under the tutelage of a *προστάτης* could *never* enjoy). He had not attached them to his *genos* as clients, but had (irregularly) made them citizens of Athens. And citizens had no need of a *προστάτης*. I cannot believe that the most important event in Athenian constitutional history was due simply to the pique of one leading politician. After all, the people is not something passive, to be moulded this way and that by its leaders, but is the active force which makes history. To make Cleisthenes solely responsible for the creation of Athenian democracy, instead of the spokesman and to some extent the guide of the people, seems to me to degrade history to the level of a game.

⁴² IG II¹ (Ed. Min.), 1325.

terms show that such a view is possible.⁴³ But it is unlikely that these two terms, which acquired such a particularised meaning in connexion with the phratries, would be used side by side if they had not this meaning here. U. Koehler⁴⁴ shows that this Dionysius was probably a member of a noble *genos*. As a *gennetes* he could not be an *orgeon*; but he appears to be a member of the *thiasos*. I suggest that the *thiasos*, of which Dionysius was treasurer, included both *gennetai* and *orgeones*, and that in the present case the *orgeones* meeting separately are honouring one who, while not of their number, is a fellow-member of the *thiasos* under the patronage of Dionysus.

An inscription of 396–5 B.C. from Deceleia⁴⁵ points to the same conclusion that the basic unit of the phratry after Cleisthenes was the *thiasos*, which comprised both *gennetai* and *orgeones*. The Dekeleieis phratry, regulating the acceptance of new members, decrees that a man, when presenting his children as candidates for membership, must produce three witnesses from his own *thiasos*. There is no mention of *genos* or *orgeones*, and, as the regulations are to apply to all phrators, it follows that the *thiasos* must have included both classes of members.

D. P. COSTELLO.

*University College of the South West,
Exeter.*

⁴³ ὀργεῶνες δ' εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπὶ τιμῇ θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων συνιόντες· ὀργιάζειν γάρ ἐστι τὸ θύειν καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα δρᾶν. θιάσός ἐστι τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον πλῆθος ἐπὶ τελετῇ καὶ τιμῇ θεῶν.

θιασῶται δ' ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ κοινωνοῦντες τῶν θιάσων.

⁴⁴ *AM.* 9, 288.

⁴⁵ *IG* II², 1237.

THE ADONIAZUSAE OF THEOCRITUS

[PLATES XVI, XVII.]

THE Fifteenth Idyll of Theocritus has probably been more admired, and has certainly received more attention from scholars, than any other Alexandrian poem; and for obvious reasons. 'It is a page,' said Matthew Arnold,¹ 'torn fresh out of the book of human life. What freedom! what animation! what gaiety! what naturalness!' The picture of contemporary manners which it presents has a charm far beyond the compass of T.'s nearest rival in this *genre*, Herodas, and, if some reservations be made on the score of language,² it is convincingly lifelike. Nevertheless, in spite of the attention it has received, it has not, I think, been viewed as clearly as it may be either in details or as a whole. Of the five sections of which this paper is composed, the first four are an attempt to bring the picture into rather sharper focus; the fifth is a briefer note upon a point of detail.³

I. *The Adonia at Alexandria*

The most recent commentary on T. is twenty years old, and it will be convenient to set out at the beginning of this paper a papyrus from which some light has fallen on the Adonia within that interval. P. Petrie 3. 142, from the Fayûm, was first published by Mahaffy and Smyly in 1905; it is dated not later than 250 B.C., so that it is nearly contemporary with *Id.* 15. I have added accents, substituted English equivalents for numbers and symbols, and appended a few explanatory notes.

	λοιπόν [cash in hand]	1 dr. 1 $\frac{3}{8}$ ob.	
6th	ὄψον	$\frac{1}{2}$	
	ῥῶα	1	
	οἶνος	2	
	ξύλα	$\frac{1}{4}$	5
	ἔλαιον	$\frac{3}{8}$	
	εἰς βάλανειον	$\frac{1}{4}$	
	κουρεῖ	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	

¹ *Essays in Criticism*, 1st series, ed. 1900, p. 205.

² The literary element in the vocabulary is reduced much below its level in the bucolic idylls, but the view of V. Magnien (*Mém. Soc. Ling. de Paris* 21. 49, cf. *Rev. Et. Gr.* 31. 377) that the dialogue parts are reliable for Syracusan dialect seems to me very rash. Gorgo and Praxinoa are no more likely to have used such words as πάρος (8) and θεσπέσιος (66) than such forms as ἰδεις (25) or ἰκτο (probable at 17).

³ In the archaeological portions of this paper I am much indebted to the advice and criticism of

Professor J. D. Beazley; in the papyrological to those of Dr. F. Heichelheim. I must also thank Professor F. E. Adcock, Mr. H. I. Bell, Dr. W. W. Tarn, and Mr. A. D. Trendall, who answered inquiries on various points of detail; the Trustees of the British Museum, the Director of the Glyptothek in Munich, and Dr. L. D. Caskey in Boston, for permission to publish objects in their charge.

In section IV I have borrowed a good deal of information from Studniczka, *Das Symposium Ptolemaios II* (*Abh. Sachs. Ges.* 30, 2), to which I refer hereafter as Studniczka.

	λοιπόν			1½ ¹ ob.
	Ἡγησίλα ²			
7th	κάρυα	2 choinikes	Χαλκιδι ³	2 dr. 10
	βαλιδικων ⁴	2 choinikes		[2] ⁵
	Ποντικῶν ⁶	1 choinix		1
	ε[ἰς] ἐλαίου [πέλ]ανον			[1] ⁵
 α ⁷			3½ 15
	ἰσχάδων πρ ⁸	3 [measures]		2
	ὄρνιθες		3	3
	σῦκα		1	
	στεφάνια τῷ Ἀδῶ-			
	νει			5½ 20
	ἐργάτη			½
	χορδαί		1	½
	/ [total]		14	2 ⁵
8th	εἰς βαλανεῖον			¼
	λάχανα			¼ 25
9th	ὔδωρ			¼
	εἰς δεικτῆριον			2
	στέφανοι			1
 α			4¼

1. The expenditure for the day is 5½ ob., leaving 1½ ob. from the 1 dr. 1½ ob. in hand on the 5th.

2. It is not obvious in what capacity Hegesilas receives payment. Glotz takes him for a nut-merchant.

3. The editors suggest κάρυα Εὐβοϊκά (Theophr. *H.P.* 1.11. 3 *al.*).

4. Unknown. Βασιλικά (Diosc. 1. 125 *al.*) would be walnuts, but this word cannot be read in the papyrus. The other nuts are probably chestnuts and hazel-nuts, but the Greek names for nuts are hard to disentangle: see *RE* 7. 2487, 9. 2508, 10. 2339.

5. Since the other items total 12 dr. 1 ob., 2 dr. 1 ob. are required to make up the day's total of 14 dr. 2 ob. Glotz's distribution is based on Hesych. πέλανος . . . καὶ ὁ τῷ μάντει διδόμενος ὀβολός.

6. κάρυα Ποντικά (Ath. 2. 53B *al.*).

7. Glotz suggests θυμίαμα.

8. The editors suggest προκνίδες, a kind of dried fig.

At first sight the papyrus is a mere scrap of household accounts, and the significance of στεφάνια τῷ Ἀδῶνι in l. 19 was not pointed out until fifteen years later, when G. Glotz, in *Rev. Et. Gr.* 33. 169, furnished the text with an acute and learned commentary from which I excerpt some salient points.

By comparison with other recorded prices, Glotz pointed out that the expenditure on provisions on the 6th was about normal, but that 1½ ob. to the barber was six times the ordinary fee; and he conjectured that it was for a ritual toilet, including shaving of the head.⁴ On the 7th expenditure on provisions has risen from 3½ ob. (including oil) to about twenty times that sum, and is enormously in excess of one person's needs;⁵

⁴ Cf. [Luc.] *de dea Syr.* 6.

where fifteen people pay 1 dr. 1 ob. for nuts, and 1 ob.

⁵ Glotz compared particularly p. Petr. 3. 136, for dried figs.

the large provision of figs and nuts recalls T. 112 ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι; the ἐλαίου πέλανος, 117 τὰ τ' ἐν ὑγρῷ ἐλαίῳ. The $\frac{1}{2}$ ob. to the ἐργάτης Glotz takes for a tip to some underling, and he compares similar payments in lists of offerings at Delos: ⁶ for the χορδαί, which he takes to be the ritual meal, he cites Ar. *Ach.* 1119, *Ran.* 339. He also calls attention to the absence of wine, common to the accounts and to T. 110–30, though the man has bought some on the previous day. The various items purchased on this day are offerings which will be consumed by the priests, notables, and such generous donors as may be invited: the same destination is to be presumed for those provided by Arsinoe in T.⁷

On the 8th the expenses for food have dropped to $\frac{1}{4}$ ob. for vegetables. It is the day following the festival, when the death of Adonis will be lamented as in T. 132–5 and his worshippers will purify themselves and fast. The 9th presents more difficulties, since in T. two days only of celebrations are contemplated, whilst the expenses for στέφανοι and δεικτήριον in the papyrus there suggest a third. Glotz supposes that the payment εἰς δεικτήριον is for admission to a δρᾶμα μυστικόν at which the στέφανοι will be worn, and that the water is holy water for sprinkling on the worshipper—a practice which he illustrates from Egyptian sources. The δρᾶμα μυστικόν, he thinks, will represent the resurrection of Adonis, and he points out that at Byblos the death of Adonis was followed by a resurrection.⁸

Here, however, we must call a halt. T. describes a Marriage of Adonis and Aphrodite (for so for the moment I will call it), followed by a lamentation over the dead Adonis; the *de dea Syria* and other late authorities speak of a lamentation followed by a resurrection. But no authority combines these three elements, and T. has said as plainly as he can be expected to say that in Alexandria after the day of mourning nothing will be heard of Adonis for another year (see 103, 143, 149). There is also another difficulty untouched by Glotz. The owner of the account-book is presumably a man,⁹ but the Adonia in Greece is essentially a women's festival, and at Alexandria, though the magnificence of Arsinoe's celebrations has attracted some male spectators (70, 89), it is still so depicted by T.¹⁰ Why, then, is this man so busy in the matter?

In short, the pieces of this puzzle do not quite fit. The cult at Byblos does not tally with that in Greece; the cult in the Fayûm may have differed from that in Alexandria—in particular, it may have taken an Egyptian tinge and borrowed from its surroundings some of the Egyptian colour which provides Glotz with numerous illustrations to the papyrus.¹¹ The

⁶ *BCH* 29. 524, 34. 128 (B.72).

⁷ An inscription of imperial date from Loryma in Caria (*BCH* 10. 259) mentions ἐρανισται συναδωνιάζοντες.

⁸ [Luc.] *de dea Syr.* 6 πρῶτα μὲν καταγίζουσι τῷ Ἀδώνιδι ὅπως εἶναι νέκυν μετὰ δὲ τῇ ἑτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ ζῶειν τέ μιν μυθολογέουσι καὶ ἐς τὸν ἥερα πέμπουσι. Jerome, *Migne P.L.* 25. 86, and Origen, *P.G.* 13. 800, also speak of a resurrection following the death, and Cyril, *P.G.* 70. 441, indicates that this was the Alexandrian ritual in his day.

⁹ Bath and barber hardly fit a woman.

¹⁰ Note the feminines 132 ἀθρόαι, 134 λύσασαι, ἀνείσαι, 143 εὐθυμεύσας. Gorgo's parting prayer uses the masculine χαίροντας (149) because the rites are on behalf of the whole community.

¹¹ Syncretism is characteristic of religious development in Egypt, and the cult of Aphrodite-Adonis is close to that of Isis-Osiris (see Glotz 173 ff.), but I do not think we ought to postulate syncretism in a festival held by Arsinoe at Alexandria.

accounts for the 7th and 8th are suggestive. In particular they seem to provide, for the first time, some parallel for the first day of Arsinoë's celebrations,¹² which shares with Greek Adonia hitherto known to us the offering of κῆποι Ἀδωνίδος (and possibly of fruits),¹³ but shares nothing else. Here, for the first time, we have an independent indication of a day of festivity preceding that of lamentation, and we are entitled to use it, though with caution, to illustrate the Idyll. Beyond that it is at present safer not to go.

The dramatic date of the Idyll is after the marriage of Arsinoë II, which apparently took place in the winter of 276–5 B.C. (or possibly a year earlier),¹⁴ and before her death in July 270.¹⁵ The season suggested by 112 is late summer or autumn. The papyrus gives the days of the month, but not its name; this, however, can now be supplied from a papyrus of 125 B.C. in the Rylands collection which mentions Adonis in connexion with the late-Ptolemaic month Gorpaios.¹⁶ Dr. Heichelheim, who is about to publish the papyrus, has kindly allowed me to see his notes upon it, from which I learn that in 275 B.C. the 7th of the corresponding Egyptian month Epeiph will have been one of the first days in September.¹⁷

The scene, then, is staged on an autumn day about the year 275 B.C. The time is fairly early in the morning, for Gorgo must get back from her expedition in time to give her husband his midday meal (147). The weather is fine and hot, and Praxinoa will need her sun-hat (39; see p. 187); but the Nile is high, in the morning and evening¹⁸ the Etesian winds may still be blowing,¹⁹ and river and breeze in conjunction provided Alexandria with a salubrious and temperate climate which was the envy of other Greeks.²⁰

¹² See n. 64 below.

¹³ Hesych. s.v. Ἀδωνίδος κῆποι· ἐν τοῖς Ἀδωνίοις εἰδῶλαν ἐξάγουσιν καὶ κήπους ἐπὶ ὀστράκου καὶ παντοδαπὴν ὀπώραν κ.τ.λ. On Attic vases of the late fifth and the fourth century women carry flower-pots up to the roofs (see Richter, *Metrop. Mus.: R.F. Athen. Vases* 219 and literature there cited), and a fragment which shows a woman with a plate of grapes about to mount a ladder has been connected with the Adonia (Deubner, *Att. Feste* 221, Taf. 25. 2); but the ladder is the only point of contact, and the ὀπώρα, mentioned only by Hesychius, may derive not from Attic usage, but from T.

¹⁴ See *JHS* 46. 161.

¹⁵ Arsinoë's celebration of the Adonia is connected with the deification of Berenike (106), and probably took place shortly after it, but the date of the deification is uncertain. It was after the *penteteris* of 279–8 B.C. (Ditt. *Syll.*³ 390), but the suggested *terminus ante quem* depends upon whether Ptolemy I and Berenike figure as Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες in the procession described by Callixenus (*Ath.* 5. 197C ff.) and, if so, upon the date of that procession, and on these points there is no agreement; see *Rh. Mus.* 53. 460, *Herm.* 65. 447, *Philol.* 86. 414, *JHS* 53. 59. I will not discuss here the relation of the poem to *Id.* 16, since from that source also no certain inferences can be drawn.

¹⁶ The papyrus is fragmentary and the restorations

too uncertain to be relied on for further information.

¹⁷ Glotz placed the month of the Fayûm papyrus later, on the ground that as the offerings at T. 112 are ὦρια, the nuts from Chalcis and Pontus in the papyrus must be of the new season, and could not have reached Egypt by September. But the first step in this argument is very precarious. At Athens the Adonia is now held to have been a spring festival (*Gnom.* 10. 290, *Hesper.* 4. 574), and it is otherwise plain that Adonis in different places was celebrated in different ways and at different seasons of the year. P. Petr. 3. 142, as has been said, does not seem reconcilable in all details with T., and it is possible that for Alexandria we cannot even rely on the Gorpaios of the Rylands papyrus; but T. 112 establishes a date about that season.

On the cult of Adonis generally see Mannhardt *Wald- u. Feldkulte* 2. 273, Frazer *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*³ 1, *RE* 1. 385.

¹⁸ Cf. Theophr. *fr.* 5. 31.

¹⁹ Ptolemy gives Aug. 31 as the date of their end in Egypt (Jo. Lyd. *de ost.* Wachsmuth p. 212. 1), but naturally the date varied from year to year (cf. Theophr. *loc. cit.* 12).

²⁰ Strab. 5. 213, 17. 793. According to Baedeker's *Egypt*,⁸ p. lxxx, Alexandria has maximum and minimum temperatures of 89° and 72° F. in July; of 82° and 68° in October.

Gorgo, attended by her maid Eutythis,²¹ comes in search of her friend Praxinoa, who lives in the outskirts of the town, and, knocking on the door, inquires whether she is at home. Praxinoa, intervening before the slave who opens the door has time to reply,²² welcomes the visitor. In a Greek house the common seat is a light four-legged stool which occupies no fixed position, but is moved about as required. Praxinoa calls for one for her friend and, in spite of polite protests, for a cushion,²³ and the pair sit down to gossip. To one item of their conversation I return at the end of this paper, but gossip is not what Gorgo has come for, and at 21 she discloses the purpose of her call. She wants to see the show, and Praxinoa must put on her outdoor dress and come with her.

II. *Praxinoa's costume*

- 21 Γ. ἀλλ' ἴθι τῶμπέχονον καὶ τὰν περονατρίδα λάξευ.
 34 Γ. Πραξινοά μάλα τοι τὸ καταπτυχὲς ἐμπερόναμα
 τοῦτο πρέπει· λέγε μοι, πόσσω κατέβα τοι ἄφ' ἰστῶ;
 Π. μὴ μνάσης Γοργοῖ· πλέον ἀργυρίῳ καθαρῶ μνᾶν
 ἢ δύο· τοῖς δ' ἔργοις καὶ τὰν ψυχὰν ποτέθηκα.
 38 Γ. ἀλλὰ κατὰ γνῶμαν ἀπέβα τοι· τοῦτό κεν εἴπαις.
 Π. τῶμπέχονον φέρε μοι καὶ τὰν θολίαν· κατὰ κόσμον
 ἀμφίθες.
 69 Π. οἴμοι δειλαία, δίχα μοι τὸ θερίστριον ἤδη
 ἔσχισται, Γοργοῖ. ποττῶ Διός, εἰ τι γένοιο
 εὐδαίμων, ὦνθρωπε φυλάσσεο τῶμπέχονόν μευ.

38²⁴ κεν εἴπαις Meineke κα[[[1]]] εἴποις P³ (ex -αῖς vel -ας) κα εἴπες KLTr Iunt. κατ' εἴπ[P²
 καλὸν εἴπες ΣPHS²: cf. CR 44.229.
 39 Interpunctit Wuestemann.

Readers who have troubled to envisage Praxinoa's clothes have probably, and rightly, thought of them in terms of terracotta statuettes, but the details will bear more investigation than they have received. And first it may be noted that on Gorgo's arrival Praxinoa is wearing her χιτῶνιον (31)—that is, an Ionic chiton, the regular indoor wear of Greek women. Gorgo, having come through the streets, is already fully dressed, and nothing is said of her costume; it is, however, the same as that presently put on by her friend, for though Praxinoa's garments are still out of sight in the clothes-chest (33),²⁵ Gorgo assumes that no choice confronts her—'Get your ἀμπέχονον and your περονατρίς,' she says.

²¹ The appearance of Eutythis at 67 may surprise the modern reader: the ancient knew from l. 1 that Gorgo had not walked the streets unattended. See, e.g., Plut. *Phoc.* 19, where it was accounted a sign of σωφροσύνη and ἀφέλεια in Phocion's wife to appear in public μετὰ μιᾶς θεραπαινίδος. At Ath. 13. 582B Gnathainion has three, besides other attendants.

²² Less probably Gorgo inquires before the door is opened (as at Aesch. *Ch.* 653), and Praxinoa opens it in person (as at Ar. *Ran.* 38).

²³ For δῖφος (or δρίφος) see *RE* 4 A 411, Richter *Anc. Furniture* 30; for the seat set for the guest *Od.* 19. 97, Apollod. *Car. fr.* 14, Herodas 6.1; for the refusal of the cushion Plaut. *Stich.* 94.

²⁴ I use P³ to denote the Antinoe papyrus, P² for p. Ox. 1618, reserving P¹ for p. Ox. 2064, which does not contain *Id.* 15.

²⁵ On this piece of furniture see Richter *Anc. Furniture* 89. It is probably a low oblong chest on short legs. The lid on vases is commonly flat, but domed or gabled examples are known from Egypt.

Of the two words she uses, ἀμπέχονον (from ἀμπέχειν) is suitable for any sort of wrap, ἀμπεχόνη is not uncommon for clothing in general, and the other occurrences of the word do not help us here.²⁶ When, however, Praxinoa's is presently imperilled in the crowd, she calls it a θερίστριον (69); and both θερίστρον, a summer garment, and its winter counterpart χείμαστρον are described as ἱμάτια.²⁷ Praxinoa's ἀμπέχονον, which is put




FIG. 1.—TERRACOTTAS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

on last and torn in the crowd, is obviously an outer garment: it will be the wrap, regularly worn by women at this period, which resembles an ample himation, but is often made of thin and clinging materials which allow the heavier folds of what is worn beneath to show through.²⁸ It can be draped about the figure in a great variety of ways, but when worn out of doors most

²⁶ Ἀμπέχονον is a woman's garment at 27. 59 (with -ην in the next line), *Ar. fr.* 320. 7, *IG* 2. 2. 754-6, ἀμπεχόναι τρίχαπτοι are smart female garments at *Pherecr. fr.* 108. 28.

²⁷ *Harpocrat. s.v.* σείρινα· σείριον ἐκάλουν λεπτόν ἱμάτιον ἀσπάθητον, οἷον θερίστρον, *Poll.* 7. 61 τὸ μέντοι

χειμερινὸν ἱμάτιον χείμαστρον ἂν λέγοις. Θερίστρον is fairly common: *e.g.* in Zenon's wardrobe, p. *Cair. Zen.* 59092, and worn by Rebekah, *Gen.* 24. 65.

²⁸ In the Brauronian inventories (*IG* 2. 2. 754-6) ἱμάτιον and ἀμπέχονον both occur, and are therefore presumably distinguishable in some way.

usually envelops both arms and often also hoods the head (Fig. 1).²⁹ Simaetha, similarly dressed for a similar occasion at 2. 74, has borrowed hers from a friend, and calls it, probably in reference to its choice material, ξυστίς. Of Praxinoa's we know only that it is flimsy (or it would not get torn) for her use of the diminutive, θερίστριον,³⁰ does not necessarily imply that the wrap is less ample than usual.

The second garment is called περονάτρις at 21, and ἑμπερόναμα at 34, and the names are fortunately descriptive, for the literary evidence is negligible. T. has περόναμα at 79, Hesychius, either from some other Doric writer or by conflation from two of T.'s words, ἑμπερονάτρις ἱμάτιον διπλοῦν, and none of the four appears elsewhere unless περονητρίς is rightly restored as an adjective at *A.P.* 7. 413.³¹ Plainly, however, all denote a garment fastened with a περόνη, which is therefore not a ἱμάτιον in the narrower archaeological sense of the word. The names would be appropriate to the Doric chiton or peplos, which was fastened by a περόνη on one or both shoulders, but here they probably denote the simpler garment which largely superseded it in the Hellenistic period. This was pinned on both shoulders, and without overhang either from shoulders or girdle;³² and, being girt below the breasts rather than at the waist, fell in longer folds than the older peplos.³³ Miss Bieber³⁴ calls this garment περονάτρις, but if that were its ordinary name, the word would be commoner, and presumably, like the peplos, of which it is only a simpler treatment, it was usually known as a χιτών, and is in fact so denoted by Simaetha at 2. 73. Most commonly, no doubt, it was made of wool: Praxinoa's was woven on the loom (35), but there is nothing to show its material, unless the price and origin are an indication: here, however, we must proceed with caution. Praxinoa does her own spinning (27), and there is some temptation to argue that she would not go to a weaver for her dress-length unless it was of some material other than wool—for instance, like Simaetha's, of βύσσος. Gorgo knows, as her question indicates, that this is no homespun, and it may indeed be that in ll. 35–37 T. told his audience a good deal about the garment. They, however, or the Alexandrians among them, knew all about Ptolemy's textile-monopoly, and we do not—not even enough to be sure that Praxinoa was at liberty to weave her own wool.³⁵ There is

²⁹ The right-hand figure is *B.M.*, C 263; the left-hand, uncatalogued, 1905, 10–24. 6. Both are from Tanagra.

³⁰ The diminutive occurs again at Aristaen. 1. 27, where a young man wears one εὐπάρυφον καὶ ποικίλον ταῖς ἀπὸ κερκίδος γραφαῖς.

³¹ ἀμπερόνα περονητρίδες.

³² It hangs like the undergarment of the left-hand woman in Fig. 1, though that may be sewn rather than pinned on the shoulders.

³³ It is perhaps to these folds that Gorgo's somewhat elusive adjective καταπτυχῆς (34) refers. Alternatively we might suppose that it refers to one of the overfolds of the peplos. The detailed fashions of this main garment are hard to follow in Hellenistic times, since they are commonly concealed by the

ἀμπέχονον. At 134, where women bare their breasts ἐπὶ σφυρὰ κόλπον ἀνεῖσαι, I suppose them to unpin the upper portion of this garment and let it fall from the girdle in front and behind, but whether girt at the waist or breast, the loose drapery would not reach the ankle unless it had had a large overfold. However, the singer is perhaps not to be trusted in so high-flown a style.

³⁴ *Entwick. gr. Kleid.* 35; see also on the garment Furtwaengler. *Coll. Sabouroff* 2. 5. Possible alternatives may be studied in R. Horn, *Stehende weibliche Gewandstatuen*.

³⁵ See *RE* 16. 179, *Jahrb. f. Gesetzgeb.* 45. 398, where, by an oversight, Praxinoa is credited with the weaving.

nothing profitable to be gathered from recorded prices of garments,³⁶ and in the end we cannot safely here go beyond what T. has told us—that the 200 dr. and more that she has paid taxed her finances. That payment, moreover, was only for the stuff, and the creation ‘cost her her very life’³⁷ before it was finished. Greek garments are draped about, not tailored to, the figure, and this is no language to use of the very simple cutting and stitching they required; nor can she refer to dyeing, which would be done before the material was made up.³⁸ She means that it is embroidered, and we shall think of her *περονατρίς*, probably brightly coloured like the garments of the statuettes, patterned with embroidery at the edges, and perhaps *semé* with stars, flowers, or some similar motif.³⁹

Here we may pause to ask whether Praxinoa is wearing only her *ἀμπέχονον* and *περονατρίς*, or whether she has put them on over the *χιτώνιον* in which we originally found her; and on this point the monuments are not very conclusive, since the Ionic under-chiton would show only at the feet or shoulders, and these critical points are more often than not concealed by the *περονατρίς* (or similar garment), which was worn long, and by the *ἀμπέχονον*. Still, where a decision is possible, though three garments are not unknown,⁴⁰ two are decidedly commoner; the weather is warm (see p. 183) and the *χιτώνιον* is wet (31). Probably therefore she is wearing two only, and it follows that for a moment between ll. 32 and 34 she stands naked.

There remains the *θολία* of 39, which is defined as *πέτασος εἰς ὃξὺ συνηγμένος* (Hesych. *s.v.*; cf. Eustath. 1934. 9) and *πλέγμα τι θολοειδὲς ἐπὶ σκιᾷ* (Poll. 10. 127, cf. 7. 174). It will be the broad conical hat often worn by women in statuettes (Fig. 1).⁴¹ The word *πλέγμα*, used of it also by Hesych. *s.v.* *σαλία* (its Laconian name), suggests that it is made of straw, and since it is worn even when the head is hooded, its object may be rather to shade the face than to protect the head. In the terracottas there is commonly visible a lump of clay between head and hat, and it is plain that this is not merely a device of the potter for attaching the separately-modelled hat, since it appears also on the only representation of this headgear known to me in any other medium, a marble relief in Munich of a sacrifice before an enthroned god or hero with two female worshippers or spectators (Pl. XVI).⁴² It will represent the side of a cap, or, more prob-

³⁶ In the third century *χιτῶνες* would seem to cost from 6 to 16 dr., but these may be male garments, and in some cases at least they are second-hand; see Segré, *Circolazione Monetaria* 160, 170. The payments to weavers of *θήνια* in p. Hib. 67, 68 at about 10 dr. per *ιστός* may be for labour only.

³⁷ Cf. Wilamowitz, *Heimkehr d. Od.* 195.

³⁸ Blümner, *Techn.* 12. 230. The elaborate process for dyeing in the piece which Plin. *N.H.* 35. 150 mentions as practised in Egypt, even if it was known at this date, cannot have been in domestic use.

³⁹ See Bieber, *Gr. Kleidung* 10. The plural *ἔργους* is suitable to such work, but is not always distinguishable in meaning from the singular (e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 1346).

⁴⁰ E.g. on the Vatican ‘Terpsichore,’ Lippold *Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus.* 3. 65, T. 7, 9, and on the Oxford

statue, Horn, *Weibl. Gewandstat.* T. 39. 2. The first is a copy, but as the replicas agree in showing the third garment it is not likely to be due to the copyist.

⁴¹ It is also glossed *σκιᾶδειον* by schol., Hesych. *s.v.* and Eustath. *loc. cit.*, and may, since the word means only a *θόλος*-shaped object (cf. Poll. 10. 138), have also meant *parasol*. A parasol, however, would be awkward to hold, owing to the *ἀμπέχονον*, and would probably be carried by a slave. It would also be excluded by the verb *ἀμφίθες* (40), though with the punctuation I prefer that might govern only *τῷ ἀμπέχονον*. For *ἀμφιτιθέναι* of headgear cf. *Il.* 10. 261, 271.

⁴² Furtwaengler, *Glyptothek* n. 206. Third or second century B.C., from Greece. I owe my knowledge of the relief to Dr. R. Lullies.

ably, of a ring or *bandeau*, designed to hold the hat firm, and in some cases to raise it above the crown of the head and secure ventilation. A similar *bandeau* is used not only in the civilised topee, but also in the rain- or sun-hats of straw or bamboo worn in China and other Far-Eastern countries which are attached sometimes to a complete cap, more commonly to a simple ring, of the same material as the hat (Fig. 2).⁴³ The *θολία* is a hat of the same type, and though there is no evidence, analogy and convenience alike suggest that in Greece also the *bandeau* was sewn or otherwise attached to the crown of the hat. How the hat was held in place on the head does not appear. The Chinese ties his below the chin, but a string from the outer edge of the brim would affect the shape of the hat, and one from the inner would interrupt the flow of the *ἰμάτιον* round cheeks and chin. Since neither effect is visible on the monuments, we may perhaps imagine a pin passing through *bandeau* and hair, and where the




FIG. 2.—CHINESE RAIN HAT.

ἰμάτιον is worn over the head, through that also. If this is so, the adjustment of wrap and hat together will be a ticklish business, and Praxinoa's anxiety in 39 is no more than natural. It will also be nearer to one process than two; and that is an additional reason for placing a colon after *θολίαν*.

At l. 44, then, our two *bourgeoises* emerge from Praxinoa's door. We do not know that Gorgo wears a hat, but otherwise they are dressed alike, except, it may be, for the colours and ornamentation of their garments; they resemble the right-hand woman in Fig. 1 or the two spectators in Pl. XVI, who are abroad on a similar errand. Praxinoa is followed by her maid Eunoea, Gorgo by Eutycheis. The costume of the attendants is left to our imagination, but on Hellenistic monuments maidservants attend

⁴³ Specimen in the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. The diameter is 2 ft. 3 in. and the interior ring for that reason much less conspicuous than in Greece. The numerous hats of this type from China and Borneo in the museum vary a good deal in size, shape and decoration, and some are without the *bandeau*, though Professor A. C. Moule tells me that in China all but the poorest

coolies use one. I have failed to obtain information, but conjecture that the Chinese chooses his crown to taste and then fits it with a *bandeau* of comfortable size, and that Greek ladies did the same. The *θολίαι* also vary in shape, being often less pointed than the specimens figured; and they were decorated, as the paint on some terracottas shows (e.g. B.M., C 264j).

their mistresses wearing a peplos with a rather long overfall at the waist, and overgirt; ⁴⁴ perhaps we may suppose Eunoia and Eutycheis so attired. At 66 the crowd forces the party into compacter formation. Gorgo and Praxinoa join hands: their attendants follow suit, and close up behind their mistresses. In the press about the doors, where Praxinoa's wrap gets torn and she is flustered, she forgets the slaves (note the dual ἄμμε at 75), but, self-possession once restored (76), she turns her head to see how they are faring.

III. *The Street Scenes*

- 4 Γ. μόλις ὕμιν ἐσώθην,
Πραξινόα, πολλῶ μὲν ὄχλῳ, πολλῶν δὲ τεθρίππων ·
παντᾶ κρηπίδες, παντᾶ χλαμυδηφόροι ἄνδρες.
- 51 Π. ἀδίστα Γοργώ, τί γενώμεθα; τοὶ πολεμισταὶ
ἵπποι τῷ βασιλῆος. ἄνερ φίλε, μή με πατήσης.
ὀρθὸς ἀνέστα ὁ πυρρός · ἴδ' ὡς ἄγριος. κυνοθαρήσῃς
Εὐνόα οὐ φευξῇ; διαχρησεῖται τὸν ἔγοντα.

51 Γοργώ *schol.*, Γοργοῖ *codd.*⁴⁵

The panic in 51 is illuminated by Photius: πολεμιστῆς ἵππος · οὐχ ὡς ἂν τις οἰηθῇ ὁ εἰς τοὺς πολέμους ἐπιτήδειος, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι σχῆμα φέρων ὡς εἰς πόλεμον εὐτρεπισμένος · ἦν γὰρ τοιοῦτον ἀγώνισμα, a gloss of which scraps are repeated at Hesych. *s.v.* πολεμιστήρια and *A.B.* 289. 6. It was first adduced by Hermann,⁴⁶ who added 'Sunt ergo quos Germanice dicimus *Paradeppferde*.' That, however, overlooked Photius's reference to games, and since it is known from inscriptions of the next century that a δίαυλος for riders of ἵπποι πολεμισταὶ formed part of the programme in games at Athens and Delphi,⁴⁷ we may safely assume that these also are on their way to the racecourse and are still in the hands of grooms (54) for that reason.

The same destination may, without hesitation, be assumed also for the τέθριππα of 5. For in the first place, if there are troops about at all (and I do not think there are) it is difficult to see what war-chariots should be doing in crowded streets where even cavalry are not mentioned; in the second, the regular war-chariot in Hellenistic times had only two horses; ⁴⁸

⁴⁴ E.g. Horn, *Weibl. Gewandstat.* 25. 2, *JdI* 20. pp. 50, 52, 129, Pfuhl, *MuZ* 3. fig. 685.

⁴⁵ Gorgo is addressed by name at 1, 36, 51, 66, 70. Π², missing in the first four places, has Γοργοῖ at 70: Π³, missing at 51, has Γοργώ elsewhere. The MSS have -οῖ at 51, and are divided elsewhere (K has -οῖ at 1 and -ω at 36, 66, 70). The scholia have -ω at 1 and 51, and are otherwise silent. The regular vocative form is -οῖ, but -ω is an alternative (Herodian 2. 756) and T. sometimes uses nom. for voc. (e.g. 1. 61)—so here is a nice puzzle for editors. At 1 and 51 the word is nearer to an exclamation than to a vocative, and it is at any rate logical to write -ω there, -οῖ elsewhere (see Headlam on Herodas 5. 55); whether that is what T. did is another matter.

⁴⁶ *Opusc.* 5. 104.

⁴⁷ *IG* 2. 1. 444-6, 2. 968, Dittenb. *Syll.*³ 697H.

⁴⁸ Cyrene at some time mustered both μόνιππα and τέθριππα (Collitz-Bechtel, *Dialektinschr.* 4833), but the *quadrigae* on her coins are agonistic, not military (B.M. Cat., *Cyrene* lxxix). On those of Ptolemy I a figure with a thunderbolt rides in a *quadriga* of horned elephants (*ibid.*; *Ptol. Kings* pl. 2. 10, 11), and there are no other chariots on Ptolemaic coins; on those of Seleukos I Athena fights from a *quadriga* or *biga* of elephants (*ibid.*; *Seleuc. Kings* pl. 1. 7, 8) but on other Seleucid and Eastern coins Nike and kings ride in *bigae* (see Tarn, *Gks in Bactria and India* 221). Antiochus Epiphanes paraded 100 ἑξίππα, and 40 τέθριππα (Polyb. 31. 3. 10),

and in the third, it is very doubtful whether Ptolemy possessed any.⁴⁹ Presumably, therefore, they are racing chariots, and it remains only to account for the men in κρηπίδες and χλαμύδες.

Κρηπίς is a nail-studded sole⁵⁰ with loops at the sides by which it was laced to the foot; ⁵¹ χλαμύς is the short cloak of Thessalian⁵² or Macedonian⁵³ origin which was fastened with a pin or brooch on the shoulder and left the right arm, or, if thrown back, both arms, free. Shoe and cloak are both military wear,⁵⁴ and when Thyonichos, discussing, at 14. 65, his friend's project of enlisting as a mercenary in Egypt, says εἴ τοι κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον ἀρέσκει | λῶπος ἄκρον περονᾶσθαι, it is to the soldier's χλαμύς that he refers. Consequently Gorgo was understood by the scholiasts, and has commonly been understood since, to mean that the streets are full of troops, though nobody has suggested what they are doing there.

The matter, however, is not so simple as that, for the dress is not confined to soldiers. At the court of Philip ὁ Φάυλλος ὑποδήσας τὴν γυναῖκα κρηπίσι καὶ χλαμύδα περιθεὶς καὶ καυσίαν Μακεδονικὴν, ὡς ἓνα τῶν βασιλικῶν νεανίσκων παρεισέπεμψε λαθοῦσαν (Plut. *Mor.* 760B),⁵⁵ and Antony in Egypt produced his sons by Cleopatra Ἀλέξανδρον μὲν ἐσθῆτι Μηδικῇ τιάραν καὶ κίταριν ὀρθὴν ἐχούση, Πτολεμαῖον δὲ κρηπίσι καὶ χλαμύδι⁵⁶ καὶ καυσίᾳ διαδηματοφόρῳ κεκοσμημένον. αὕτη γὰρ ἦν σκευὴ τῶν ἀπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου βασιλέων, ἐκείνη δὲ Μήδων καὶ Ἀρμενίων (Plut. *Ant.* 54).⁵⁷ Court-wear might indeed be military, but for courtiers and soldiers alike the dress was national,⁵⁸ and the Silens in Ptolemy's procession who appeared ἐν πορφυραῖς χλαμύσι καὶ κρηπίσι λευκαῖς

but if these and the τέθριππα of Cyrene were used in war, it was probably for transporting troops (Aen. Tact. 16. 14) rather than for fighting. Seleucid war-chariots were scythed (see next note), and in spite of the statement that Mithridates used them (Plut. *Sull.* 15) it is hard to believe in scythed *quadrigae*, for the extra horses would either mask the scythes or require a chariot of most unwieldy width.

⁴⁹ Appian (*proem.* 10), in a passage professedly based on official documents, credits Ptolemy Philadelphus with ἄρματα ἐς μάχας δισχίλια, but it is doubtful if any reliance can be placed on this, for his lists, though they may contain a kernel of truth (see Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* 456), are full of gross exaggerations. Against chariots it may be said that they did not appear with αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἱππικαὶ καὶ πεζικαὶ in the procession which seems to have celebrated a successful war (Ath. 5. 202F; cf. *JHS* 53. 59), and they are not mentioned by T. at 17. 93, or in any account of a Ptolemaic battle, or, if I may judge from the silence of Lesquier, *Inst. milit. de l'Egypte*, in the papyri or inscriptions which give a fairly detailed picture of the Ptolemaic army.

The chariot as an instrument of war, when obsolete in Greece, survived at Cyrene and Barca in northern Africa (Xen. *Cyr.* 6. 1. 27, Aen. Tact. 16. 14, Diod. 20. 41), and in Asia, where they were used by Seleucus I (Diod. 20. 113, Plut. *Demetr.* 28, 48) and later Seleucids (e.g. Liv. 37. 40. 12, 1 Macc. 1. 17); Mithridates had them in Greece (Plut. *Sull.* 15, 18, App.

Mithr. 42). These were scythed chariots, and would have been out of the question in a crowded street. No doubt the scythes were detachable but one would expect them to have been fitted for parade.

It will appear from what has been said that Hiero of Syracuse also is unlikely to have had war-chariots—a point to be remembered in considering the text of T. 16. 72.

⁵⁰ Plin. *N.H.* 36. 127, Plut. *Alex.* 40, *al.*

⁵¹ Plin. *N.H.* 35. 85, Gell. 13. 22. 5.

⁵² Poll. 7. 46. 10. 124; see Pearson on Soph. *fr.* 777.

⁵³ Ammon. *s.v.*, Ptolem. *Ascal.* (*Herm.* 22. 395) Μακεδόνων ἐστὶν εὖρημα καὶ ἔχει κυκλωτέρῃ τὰ κάτω. For the curved edge of the Macedonian chlamys see, e.g. Hamdy Bey and Reinach, *Necrop. Roy.* Pl. 31: the Greek is cut straight.

⁵⁴ Poll. 7.83 (κρηπίδες) τὸ μὲν φόρημα στρατιωτικόν.

⁵⁵ According to Tzetzes (Kaibel *C.G.F.* 31) Callimachus was once a νεανίσκος τῆς αὐλῆς: Suidas uses the phrase συσταθῆναι τῷ βασιλεῖ.

⁵⁶ Cobet's χλανίδι (*V.L.* 151) is sufficiently disproved by the preceding passage, and I do not know why Sintenis accepted, or Lindskog and Ziegler record, such a conjecture.

⁵⁷ So Caracalla, aping Alexander, wore a καυσία and κρηπίδες (Herodian 4. 8. 2).

⁵⁸ So Perseus appears as a captive φαῖον ἱμάτιον ἀμπεχόμενος καὶ κρηπίδας ἔχων ἐπιχωρίους (Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 34).

(Ath. 5.198A) were heralds, not soldiers, for one carried a petasos and herald's staff and the other a trumpet.

I think, therefore, that recent commentators, misled by modern ideas of troops in uniform, have swallowed too readily what the scholiast says, and that though the crowd no doubt included soldiers, they were off duty. If Gorgo had meant troops on service or parade, she would have mentioned not their clothes, but their arms,⁵⁹ and, though soldiers on duty wore κρηπίδες and χλαμύς, so no doubt did also soldiers out for the day, discharged veterans, κληροῦχοι who held their land with a liability to service in the army, and indeed most Macedonians and many Greeks in Alexandria on any occasion which called for smartness. T.'s Idyll is wholly Greek in colour;⁶⁰ and though in Praxinoa's allusion to the depravity of the natives (47 ff.) we may, if we choose, find a trace of the tension which necessarily underlay the relations between the dominant Greeks and Macedonians and the unprivileged Egyptians,⁶¹ she does not go much beyond what other Greeks had said of Egyptians before⁶² or what any Greek might say of any barbarian; and, apart from references to the royal family, the scenes as depicted might be staged in any Greek town. Still, Alexandria had a large and mixed population of Egyptians, Jews and other Levantines; and since it lay in a narrow strip of ground between the harbours on the Mediterranean and those still busier on Lake Mareotis (Strab. 17. 793), these people, though they may have lived in their own quarters of the town,⁶³ must have thronged its streets as they discharged the multifarious business of the several ports.

The Adonia, whatever the origin of the cult in Greece⁶⁴ and whatever it may subsequently have become in Egypt, is depicted by T. at

⁵⁹ Cf., for example, Dio Chrys. 12. 19 ἐνθα γέ ἦν ὄρεν πανταχοῦ μὲν ξίφη, πανταχοῦ δὲ θώρακας, πανταχοῦ δὲ δόρατα, πάντα δὲ ἵππων, πάντα δὲ ὄπλων, πάντα δὲ ὠπλισμένων ἀνδρῶν μεστά. When Umbricius, at Juv. 3. 248, says *in digito claus mihi militis haeret* he is talking of a motley crowd not of troops marching through the streets.

⁶⁰ It is just worth remark that Praxinoa's domestic animal is still the Greek weasel (28), though Callimachus, a native of Africa, is so familiar with the Egyptian cat that he introduces it to the heroic household of Triopas (*H.* 6. 111).

It is conceivable (but I do not think it probable) that there is some allusion to local cults at 64 and 101, for the nuptials of Zeus and Hera were celebrated at πανηγυρίδες in Egypt, and Aphrodite was χρυσῇ ἐκ παλαιᾶς παραδόσεως. (Diod. 1. 97.)

⁶¹ For a general estimate of their relations see *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 43. 270; for native grievances, *Rev. Belge de Phil.* 12. 1005; and for crimes of violence in Ptolemaic Egypt, Cumont, *L'Égypte des Astrol.* 66.

⁶² Aesch. *fr.* 373, Cratin. *fr.* 378, Plat. *Laus* 747C: see Starkie on Ar. *Nub.* 1130.

⁶³ A Jewish quarter was established by Alexander (Jos. *Bell. Iud.* 2. 18. 7). Rakotis, the old village incorporated in the western part of Alexandria (fig. 3), is commonly stated to have been the Egyptian

quarter, but I know of no evidence that it was so, nor that the Jewish quarter was in the N.E. corner of the town where Neroutsos Bey marks it.

⁶⁴ It has often been suggested that it came immediately from Cyprus (so most recently *Gnom.* 10. 291, *Hesper.* 4. 573). It is worth notice, therefore, that T. stresses this connexion (100); Dione (106) is also associated elsewhere with the Cyprian Aphrodite (17. 36, Eur. *Hel.* 1098, Dion. Per. 509). Eryx (101), the richest shrine in Sicily (Polyb. 1. 55. 8), is no doubt chosen as being at the opposite extremity of Aphrodite's domain.

It is possible that the first day of rejoicing, which distinguishes the Alexandrian Adonia (p. 183) may derive from Cyprus, but it may also have been a Ptolemaic innovation, for Ptolemy Soter had ideas about cult (see Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* 1. 24). The emphasis on Cyprus is equally explicable by the fact that since 294 B.C. the island had been in Ptolemy's hands; and it may be for that reason that Arsinoe herself, after her deification as Aphrodite, was called Κυπρίς by Posidippus (Weil, *Un Pap. inedit* p. 31).

There are traces of the Adonis-cult from Phoenician colonies in Africa (*Berytus* 3. 31) but it is very unlikely that these have any bearing on the matter.

Alexandria as a Greek holiday. The actual rites, however, as has been said above (p. 182), concern the women only. Gorgo's husband and Praxinoa's are elsewhere, and since we have now found a counter-attraction, we may not uncharitably suppose that those two scapegraces have gone to the race-meeting. And when Gorgo tells us that the streets are full of men in Macedonian dress, I understand her to mean that, for once in a while, barbarians are outnumbered in the crowd, that the male population of Greeks and Macedonians is abroad in its best clothes,⁶⁵ and that cloaks and hobnails, chariots and chargers, are all bound in the one direction.⁶⁶




FIG. 3.—PLAN OF ANCIENT ALEXANDRIA.

However that may be, if the ἵπποι πολεμιστῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ are going to the races, the street-scenes in the *Idyll* can be located with some precision. The palace at Alexandria, to which the women are going, occupied and extended from the promontory called Λοχιάς which enclosed the harbour on the N.E. (Strab. 17. 794), and, with the buildings connected with it, occupied a fifth, and subsequently an even larger fraction of the town (*ibid.* 793, Plin. *N.H.* 5. 62). The barracks, as might be expected, were σύνεγγυς τῆς αὐλῆς (Polyb. 15. 28. 4, 29.1). The town, laid out by Deinokrates in rectangular blocks, ἅπασα μὲν ὁδοὶ κατατέμνεται ἵππηλάτοις καὶ ἄρματηλάτοις, δυσὶ δὲ πλατυτάταις ἐπὶ πλείον ἢ πλείον ἀναπεπταμέναις, αἱ δὲ δίχα καὶ πρὸς ὀρθὰς τέμνουσιν ἀλλήλας (Strab. 17. 793). Of these two main streets, that which divided the town laterally from S.W. to N.E. ended on the N.E. at the Canopic

⁶⁵ So Meineke, ed. 3. p. 482.

⁶⁶ For the benefit of those who cling to soldiers, I will mention that Antiochus Epiphanes on a special

occasion began games with a parade of troops (Polyb. 31. 3)

Gate, outside which was the hippodrome (*ibid.* 795). If the horses are proceeding from the palace or the barracks to the hippodrome, they will presumably go down one of the streets leading from the palace to the main street, turn to the left in the latter, and leave the town by the Canopic Gate (Fig. 3).⁶⁷ Gorgo and Praxinoa, who are walking in the opposite direction, meet and pass them in one of these two streets, or possibly in αἱ περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν εὐρυχωρίαι (Polyb. 15. 30. 4). They are still some way from their destination, for at 60 they are not sure that the woman they meet has emerged from the palace, and it is not until 65 that they come in sight of the doors of the palace or of that part of it in which the display is staged.

IV. *Arsinoe's Tableau*

- 78 Γ. Πραξινόα, πόταγ' ὦδε. τὰ ποικίλα πρᾶτον ἄθρησον,
λεπτὰ καὶ ὡς χαρίεντα · θεῶν περονάματα φασεῖς.
- 80 Π. πότνι' Ἀθαναία, ποῖαί σφ' ἐπόνασαν ἔριθοι,
ποῖοι ζωογράφοι τάκριβέα γράμματ' ἔγραψαν.
ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκαντι καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδινεῦντι,
ἔμψυχ' οὐκ ἐνυφαντά. σοφόν τοι χρῆμ' ἀνθρωπος.
αὐτὸς δ' ὡς θαητὸς ἐπ' ἀργυρέας κατάκειται
- 85 κλισμῷ πρᾶτον ἴουλον ἀπὸ κροτάφων καταβάλλων,
ὁ τριφίλητος Ἀδωνις, ὁ κῆν Ἀχέροντι φιληθεῖς.
- 84 ἀργυρέας \mathbb{P}^3 *codd. pler.* -έω OAE.
86 φιληθεῖς \mathbb{P}^2 \mathbb{P}^3 φιλεῖται *codd.*
- 111 Ἀρσινόα πάντεσσι καλοῖς ἀτιτάλλει Ἀδωνιν.
† πᾶρ μὲν οἱ † ὦρια κείται ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι,
πᾶρ δ' ἀπαλοὶ κᾶποι πεφυλαγμένοι ἐν ταλαρίσκοις
ἀργυρέοις, Συρίω δὲ μύρω χρύσει' ἀλάβαστρα,
115 εἶδατα δ' ὅσσα γυναῖκες ἐπὶ πλαθάνω πονέονται
ἄνθεα μίσγοισι λευκῷ παντοῖα μαλεύρω,
ὅσσα τ' ἀπὸ γλυκερῷ μέλιτος τά τ' ἐν ὑγρῷ ἐλαίῳ.
πάντ' αὐτῷ πετεηνὰ καὶ ἔρπετὰ τῇδε πάρεστι ·
χλωραὶ δὲ σκιάδες μαλακῷ βρίθοντες ἀνήθω
- 120 δέδμανθ', οἱ δὲ τε κῶροι ὑπερπωτῶνται ἔρωτες
οἱοὶ ἀηδονιδῆες ἀεξομενᾶν ἐπὶ δένδρῳ
πωτῶνται πτερύγων πειρώμενοι ὄζον ἀπ' ὄζω.
ὦ ἔβενος, ὦ χρυσός, ὦ ἐκ λευκῷ ἐλέφαντος
αἰετοὶ οἰνοχόον Κρονίδᾳ Διὶ παῖδα φέροντες,
125 πορφύρεοι δὲ τάπητες ἄνω μαλακώτεροι ὕπνω.
ἂ Μίλατος ἐρεῖ χῶ τὰν Σαμίαν καταβόσκων ·
'ἔστρωται κλίνα τῶδώνιδι τῷ καλῷ ἄμμιν.'
τὸν μὲν Κύπρις ἔχει τὰν δ' ὁ ῥοδόπαχυς Ἀδωνις ·
ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ἡ ἐννεακαίδεχ' ὁ γαμβρός ·
130 οὐ κεντεῖ τὸ φίλημ', ἔτι οἱ περὶ χεῖλεα πυρρὰ.
νῦν μὰν Κύπρις ἔχοισα τὸν αὐτᾶς χαιρέτω ἄνδρα.

119 βρίθουσαι \mathbb{P}^3 BD127 ἄμμιν *scripsi* ἄλλα \mathbb{P}^3 *codd.*124 αἰετοὶ \mathbb{P}^3 KPW²L²Tt² -τῷ *cett.*128 τὸν μὲν Rossbach τὰν μὲν \mathbb{P}^3 *codd.*⁶⁷ Adapted from Neroutsos Bey, *L'ancienne Alexandrie*.

Let us begin with the scene adumbrated in the Argive singer's hymn—for so its formal close (143 f.) invites us to call it—and first a brief word on the text in so far as it at present concerns us.

L. 118 has always, I think, been connected with what precedes, and understood to denote cakes in the shape of animals and birds. There is nothing impossible in this,⁶⁸ but it is not apparent why the offerings should be confined to δεύτεροι τράπεζαι, and p. Petr. 3. 142 includes chickens and χορδαί (p. 181). I understand 118 therefore to refer to the meat-dishes, and have punctuated accordingly—to the improvement, unless I am mistaken, of the run of the passage.

Ll. 127 f. with ἄλλα|τὸν μὲν present us with Aphrodite and Adonis on separate couches. This has long been thought improbable on *a priori* grounds, and 130 f. seem plainly to imply that Aphrodite is embracing and kissing Adonis, who must therefore be on the same couch. The simplest remedy for τὸν μὲν is to detach the sentence from what precedes and accept Rossbach's τὸν ("Ἀδωνιν"); ἔχει will then have the same sense as, and be resumed by, ἔχοισα in 131. For ἄλλα (which can only be preserved by the desperate expedient of supposing that it means *yet another*—this year as well as before) I prefer the dative of the agent to Ahrens's ἑμέ, because it is the στρώματα, not the κλῖνα, which are provided by Miletus and the shepherds of Samos.⁶⁹ I assume, therefore, that there is only one couch, and those who cling to two will have to make some modification in what follows.

The singer's survey begins, at 112, with the offerings and the general setting. There are fruits and nuts, and the Ἀδωνίδος κῆποι, contained here not in the ornamental flower-pots of Attic practice, but in silver baskets,⁷⁰ which will, if the Attic rite is in force, be thrown into the sea with the image of Adonis;⁷¹ there are perfumes of the choicest kinds,⁷² ornamental breads⁷³ and cakes of every sort, and (if I am right as to 118) every sort of meat and game. These will be set out on round tables with three legs, their tops level with the seat of the couch (Figs. 4, 7).⁷⁴ Over all there are arbours of greenery which deserve a special glance.

Σκιάς is used of any canopy, whether of gold or tapestry, such as those which sheltered Xerxes and Cleopatra at Plut. *Them.* 16, *Ant.* 26, or, as here,

⁶⁸ See Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 1079, Hase, *Palaeologus* 161. Cakes shaped like animals seem, however, usually to have been cheap substitutes for the animal (see Hdt. 2. 47, Suid. s.v. βούς ἑβδομος *al.*), and Arsinoë was not economising.

⁶⁹ It is indeed conceivable that Miletus supplied the couch, Samos the coverlets, in which case ἑμέ will be preferable. Critias *fr.* 5 (Ath. 11. 486E) mentions κλῖνη Μιλησιουγῆς καὶ δίφρος Μιλησιουργῆς, and the former reappears at *IG* 1². 330, apparently among Alcibiades's effects, though its nature is unknown (*cf.* Watzinger, *Gr. Holz sarcophagi* 91). At first sight the variation of phrase (Μιλετος . . . ὁ τ. Σ. καταβόσκων) might be thought to favour this interpretation, but Milesian wool was famous throughout antiquity and prized in Egypt (*p.* Cair. Zen. 59195, *p.* Zen. Mich. 107), whereas of Samian

we know no more than that Polycrates had imported sheep from Miletus (Ath. 12.540D). It is difficult, therefore, where blankets are in question, to suppose Miletus extolled for carpentry.

⁷⁰ Note 13 above. For τάλαροι used in forcing plants see Theophr. *C.P.* 5. 6. 6.

⁷¹ Zenob. 1. 49, Eustath. 1701. 45. On the κῆποι see Mannhardt, *Wald- u. Feldkulte* 2. 279, Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* 3 236.

⁷² *Cf.* Ath. 15. 689A.

⁷³ I agree with Vollgraff (*BCH* 48.134) that ἀνθεα means *colours* not *socii florum*. This sense of the noun, fairly common in later writers, is probably much older than T., for ἀνθίζειν, εὐανθής are used of colour in the fifth century and ἀνθος is at least very near the sense at Theogn. 452, Aesch. *P.V.* 23.

⁷⁴ See Studniczka 123.

a rustic arbour. The most convenient literary parallel for ours is that which shades Dionysos in Ptolemy's procession at Ath. 5.198D: σκιὰς ἐκ κισσοῦ καὶ ἀμπέλου καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ὁπώρας κεκοσμημένη, προσήρτηντο δὲ καὶ στέφανοι καὶ ταινίαι καὶ θύρσοι καὶ τύμπανα καὶ μίτραι πρόσωπά τε σατυρικά καὶ κωμικά καὶ τραγικά. Dionysos's arbour has an obvious appropriateness to the god, and these may have some to Adonis, who is closely connected with vegetation, but arbours were popular,⁷⁵ and greenery is commonly represented in Greek banqueting scenes, even if it is no more than a few sprigs on the wall.⁷⁶ I reproduce from an Apulian amphora in Naples (Fig. 4)⁷⁷ a scene of



FIG. 4.—FROM AN APULIAN AMPHORA IN NAPLES

Dionysos and Ariadne banqueting in an arbour formed by the interlacing tendrils of two vines. T. has not told us of what Arsinoe's σκιάδες were made, for dill, an umbelliferous herb too small to form the arbour itself, owes its presence only to the perfume which recommended its use also in garlands,⁷⁸ and is presumably intertwined with, or suspended from, the main structure. The Erotes that fly there might at any time attend Aphrodite, but are particularly in place at her union with Adonis. We shall think of them in terms of the gaily painted terracotta Erotes, meant for suspension, of which I figure some examples from Myrina (Pl. XVII).⁷⁹ Of the plural σκιάδες I shall suggest an explanation presently (p. 201).

⁷⁵ Cf. Ath. 5. 196D, 207D; Studniczka 60.

⁷⁶ E.g. Langlotz, *Gr. Vasen in Würzburg* T. 247.

⁷⁷ Heydemann 3242; about 330 B.C.

⁷⁸ Cf. 7. 63, Theophr. *H.P.* 9. 7. 3, *C.P.* 6. 9. 3, Ath. 15. 674D, E.

⁷⁹ In the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; left to right, D. Burr *Terracottas from Myrina* 46, 49, 50: 54, 53, 51. Miss Burr dates 46 early in, 49 in the middle of, and the rest late in, the second century B.C. They

are therefore somewhat later than our period. Dr. L. D. Caskey, to whom I am indebted for the photographs, tells me that the terracottas were suspended from their original hanging-holes, but that wires were used, since, when hung with string, the figures showed too great a tendency to rotate. Ancient string, which was made of rushes, (σπαρτίον, σχοινίον) or of flax (*Xen. Cyn.* 2. 4, 10. 1, *Poll.* 5. 27), may have been more resistant to torque, but a

The setting thus disposed of, the singer turns at 123 to her main theme—the couch with the figures on it. She begins from the ground—the couch, the blankets laid upon it,⁸⁰ the figures on the coverlets—and gives us at once the colour-note. The couch is a symphony in ebony and gold, ivory and crimson,⁸¹ set against the green of the σκιάδες in which the flying Erotes with tinted flesh and coloured or gilt garments and wings provide another note of gay colour.

Ganymede presents two difficulties. First, one would have expected a golden eagle to carry an ivory Ganymede, and there have been those who construed ἐκ λευκῷ ἐλέφαντος with οἰνοχόον: I envy them their intrepidity, but, being without it, must suppose the whole group to be of ivory. Secondly, the position of this scene is not plain. Greek couches have rectangular or turned legs, the former by now going out of fashion, and rising above the legs a head-rest at one or either end. The rectangular type of rest is giving way in the third century to the curved form familiar on Roman couches, and either might be decorated with figures;⁸² but the head-rest is hardly sufficiently conspicuous to merit the attention here devoted to Ganymede, and the curved form, which is probably to be assumed, provides a field into which it would be very difficult to fit Ganymede in the grip of an eagle. This last objection rules out also the lateral members of the couch, which were sometimes decorated,⁸³ and I conclude that Ganymede formed, or formed part of, the legs. This solution is open to one objection, but has two advantages. The objection is that I know of no Hellenistic example of a leg so elaborately decorated; but sculptured supports are very common for Roman furniture of various kinds, and it is difficult to believe that they had no Hellenistic prototypes.⁸⁴ The advantages are these. First, we can now understand the plural αἰετοί: it is not Ganymede in the grip of more than one eagle, but two or more groups of Ganymede and the eagle. There will be one to each of the two front legs of the couch (which will of course be viewed from the long side), and there may be one on all four legs. Secondly, Ganymede in the grip of the eagle,

tendency to swing and rotate would impart a liveliness to them in Arsinoë's setting.

The word κῶποι is not very distinctive, for it is used of all ages up to early manhood, and T. is perhaps conscious of the other meaning *puppet* (Soph. *fr.* 5361'), for that is what, in fact, they are.

In Ptolemy's procession were δεινὰ ἐξ ὧν ἀνέστητο θηρία παντοδαπά καὶ ὄρνεα (Ath. 5.201B), but these may have been alive.

⁸⁰ I cannot consider seriously the view that ἄνω goes with μολακώτεροι and means that the blankets have a nap on one side only.

⁸¹ The combination of ivory and crimson in bed and bedclothes was evidently admired in antiquity (Plat. *Com. fr.* 208, Varro, *Men. fr.* 447, Cat. 64. 48, *Ciris* 440, Hor. *Sat.* 2. 6. 102). Ptolemy's ἔβεος, like his ivory, came from Ethiopia (Ath. 5. 201A; cf. Hdt. 3. 97, 114) though an Indian variety was known (Theophr. *H.P.* 4. 4. 6).

⁸² Figures in relief on the rectangular type on a

terracotta couch from Tanagra, C. L. Ransom, *Couches and Beds*, frontisp.; the curved form, at least in Roman times, commonly has an animal's head at the top, often a bust at the bottom, and sometimes engraved scenes between (*ibid.* pls. 8–17).

⁸³ They might, as Professor Beazley points out, be decorated with numerous little groups of Ganymede and the eagle, but if the groups were small enough to go on a lateral member the attention given to them here would again be somewhat surprising. It is, moreover, not certain that the lateral members of the couch are visible; they may, as in Figs. 4 and 7, be concealed by the στρώματα.

⁸⁴ E.g. Richter, *Anc. Furniture* Figs. 325–36. At Ptolemy's symposium the guests had κλίνει χρυσεῖα σφιγγόποδες (Ath. 5. 197A, on which see Studniczka 118), and couches are often represented with a sphinx interpolated in a turned leg. Note also the sculptured throne in Pl. XVI and the table-legs in fig. 7.



FIG. 5.—GROUP IN THE VATICAN.

[*Phot. Alinari.*]

if conceived after the manner of the group in the Vatican commonly associated with Leochares (Fig. 5),⁸⁵ forms a T-shaped composition very

⁸⁵ Head and wings of eagle; nose, neck, right forearm, most of left arm, both legs below the knee, and right foot of Ganymede; and most of the dog

are restorations. Only the left arm, however, is seriously misleading.

suitable for a support, and I picture the spread wings of the bird supporting or covering the angle between the horizontal and the vertical members of the couch. If the groups are set not frontally but at the corners, the wings may be folded back, one on the front, one on the end of the couch, which, with its ebony and gilt, will be much in the *Empire* style.⁸⁶

Of the figures on the couch there is little to say. As I have already argued (p. 194), Aphrodite and Adonis are embracing; but they are separable, for Adonis is to be carried to the shore next day by the women (132), and, for the same reason, he at any rate is of light construction. Probably they are made of wood, wax or plaster:⁸⁷ certainly they will be realistically coloured (*cf.* 130). In work of this kind Alexandrian coroplasts were highly skilled—witness the numerous figures, often of gigantic size, carried in Ptolemy's procession⁸⁸—and we may suitably compare the decorations of the σκηνή for his symposium, which contained, besides innumerable statues, ἄντρα in which were συμπόσια ἀντία ἀλλήλων . . . τραγικῶν τε καὶ κωμικῶν καὶ σατυρικῶν ζῶων ἀληθινὸν ἔχόντων ἱματισμόν, οἷς παρέκειτο καὶ ποτήρια χρυσᾶ (Ath. 5. 196F).⁸⁹ Arsinoe's tableau is a symposium of much the same kind.

What remains of the hymn is concerned with the ceremonies of the following day, into which we need not follow it; it is time to turn back and consider the details which have thrown Gorgo and Praxinoa into such ecstasies on their first entry (78 ff.). These are stuffs with scenes, or at any rate figures, on them, and they are woven (83 ἐνυφαντά). They can hardly be the bedclothes, for these we know to be crimson and of downy softness; nor garments worn by Aphrodite and Adonis (if they wore any), or Gorgo would not *compare* them to the raiment of gods (79).⁹⁰ They must surely be tapestries, the hangings of the place in which the tableau is staged.⁹¹ Gorgo begins at the beginning, and these catch her eye immediately on entry, before she has forced her way through the crowd or come in sight of the main object of their visit. She has also told us their subject. The Adonis of the tableau is on a gilt-and-ebony κλίνη; here he is in a silver κλισμός⁹² which, from the description at Ath. 5. 192E, is generally, and no doubt rightly, identified with the only Greek form of chair which has a back—that in which the legs are continued upwards, often in an elegant ogival curve, and joined by a cross-piece at about the shoulder-level of the

⁸⁶ For furniture of this sort see Cumont, *L'Egypte des Astrol.* 100.

⁸⁷ κοροπλάθοι· οἱ τοὺς κόρους πλάττοντες κηρῷ ἢ γύψῳ (Suidas).

⁸⁸ Ath. 5. 198C, F, 200D, 201C, D, F, 202C, *cf.* Cumont, *L'Egypte des Astrol.* 101.

⁸⁹ *Cf.* Studniczka 93.

⁹⁰ Greek garments being mostly rectangular pieces of stuff, you may, as here, think of a piece of tapestry as worn, or, conversely, like Ptolemy for his symposium (Ath. 5. 196E) use as hangings χιτῶνες χρυσοῦφεις ἐφαπτίδες τε κάλλισται, τινὲς μὲν εἰκόνας ἔχουσαι τῶν βασιλέων ἐνυφασμένας, αἱ δὲ μυθικὰς διαθέσεις. So Alexander's wedding-apartment was hung (Ath. 12. 538D) ἱματίοις τε καὶ ὀθονίοις πολυτελέσι, and the

throne of the Persian king has a ἱμάτιον as awning (*ibid.* 514C). For pictures on himatia see p. 203.

⁹¹ The ζωγράφοι will presumably be the artists to whose designs the weavers worked. For the description *cf.* Ath. 5. 197B (Ptolemy's σκηνή) ψιλὰι περσικαὶ . . . ἀκριβῆ τὴν εὐγραμμίαν τῶν ἐνυφασμένων ἔχουσαι ζωδίων.

⁹² κλισμῶ has been suspected owing to the surprising gender of ἀργυρέας, but variations of gender in this declension, some of them due to dialect, are not uncommon (Kühner-Blass 1. 409), and T. himself has, unusually, ἡ νάρκισσος (1. 133). The gender of βρίθοντες at 119 is a difficulty of another order.

person seated.⁹³ It follows that, as the light transition also suggests, Praxinoa is not referring to the tableau, but to a representation of Adonis in the tapestry. And when she alludes to him as ὁ κῆν Ἀχέροντι φιληθείς, I have no doubt that she means what the goatherd means at 3. 46, τὰν δὲ καλὰν Κυθήρειαν ἐν ὥρεσι μῆλα νομεύων|οὐχ οὕτως ὠδωνις ἐπὶ πλεον ἄγαγε λύσσας|ᾧστ' οὐδὲ φθιμένον νιν ἄτερ μαζοῖο τίθητι; or Bion at *Epit. Ad.* 13 Κύπριδι μὲν τὸ φίλημα καὶ οὐ ζώντος



FIG. 6.—FRESCO FROM POMPEII.

[Phot. Anderson.]

ἀρέσκει: and that the scene which evokes the exclamation is the dead or dying Adonis attended by Aphrodite.⁹⁴ A hint for the composition we may find in the well-known fresco from the *Casa di Adonide* at Pompeii (Fig. 6), where Adonis is dying on a κλισμός⁹⁵ and Aphrodite stands behind. Perhaps, however, we should picture her embracing him; and there will be more figures in attendance.⁹⁶ And if we wish to infer from ἐνδινεῦντι

⁹³ Richter, *Anc. Furniture* 45.

⁹⁴ Conceivably she might be referring to the story that Persephone was Aphrodite's rival for Adonis (Apoll. 3. 14. 4, Schol. T. 3. 48, *Orph. H.* 56. 8), but mythological erudition is not her style, and if that is what T. meant, we are no longer, as we should be, in a position to guess the scene represented.

⁹⁵ Adonis commonly expires not on a couch, but in a

sitting position—on a rock when the scene is closely combined with the boar-hunt; see Robert, *Ant. Sarkophag-rel.* 3, T. 2–5.

⁹⁶ If, as is likely, they include Erotes, further hints for their occupations may be derived from Bion, *Epit. Ad.* 80 ff., which look to be suggested by a picture.

that some of them are dancing,⁹⁷ let us take heart and remember Ar. *Lys.* 392 ἡ γυνὴ δ' ὀρχουμένη, | Αἶαι Ἰάδωνιν, φησίν.

It appears, then, that the place in which the bower of Aphrodite and Adonis is displayed is hung with tapestries on which at least one other scene from the myth, the hero's death, is depicted. Except that it is within the palace-precincts (60), we are not told what the place is. It is natural to remember that for his symposium of 130 κλῖναι Ptolemy erected a special σκηνή in which tapestries, carpets and hangings were largely used,⁹⁸ and Arsinoe may have done the like for her entertainment. The tapestries, however, are no evidence that she did so, for at this date hangings are often represented on the walls of more substantial buildings even when, as in Fig. 7, they are open to the sky;⁹⁹ they are also suspended from branches of trees and other supports when no wall is available (Pl. XVI). It follows, therefore, that the bower may have been staged in an open court or garden; an open-air setting would suit both theme and season, and the precincts of the palace included what Strabo (17. 794) calls ἄλση. If one of these is the scene, the σκιάδες will have been partly at least, as on the vases, formed by living trees.

There remain one or two points in connexion with the display on which a word should be said. And first, what is the scene represented? That it is, in some sense, the union of Aphrodite and Adonis is obvious, but the day is still young, all this display of food, even if we remember the καταχύσματα of a Greek wedding, seems out of place in a bridal chamber, and it is hardly necessary to compare the hymn with *Id.* 18 to observe that its tone is no more than discreetly hymeneal. Here, however, a useful comparison is provided by the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus 64, a poem commonly suspected of reflecting a Hellenistic original. The day is a holiday (32), the guests assemble, and the *puluinar geniale* of ivory and purple is set for the goddess among the seats and tables of the guests (45). The preparations are viewed by the populace (267); when they depart, the guests arrive (278), and Chiron brings trees from Pelion to make (as in T.) a σκιάς (292). They take their places, the feast is laid out, and the Parcae begin their song, which, though it foretells the destiny of Achilles, is no epithalamium, but still looks forward to the arrival of the bride and to the consummation of the bridal (328). In T. bride and bridegroom are already united, but, as I understand the matter, the couch on which they recline is not at the moment their bridal couch, though when the spectators depart and the tables are cleared it will become so. The scene at which we and the populace are invited to be present is rather the wedding-feast, which differs from that in Catullus in that there are no guests. Perhaps the crowd, which

⁹⁷ The inference is not inevitable (see *Od.* 9.153, *Ap. Rh.* 2. 695, 4. 1456), but the verb and its cognates are most commonly used of rhythmical movement, as of constellations, dancers, tumblers.

⁹⁸ *Ath.* 5. 196A ff. For earlier examples of such hangings see *Eur. Ion* 1141 ff., *Ar. Ran.* 938, *fr.* 611, and perhaps *Vesp.* 1215 (where the meaning of κρεκάδισ is not certain), *Ath.* 12. 538D, 539E. On Egyptian weaving see Cumont, *L'Egypte des Astrol.* 88.

⁹⁹ B.M. 2190; the so-called Ikarios relief. For replicas in Paris, Naples and Rome see Schreiber *Hellen. Reliefbild.* 38-40; for one from Ephesus and for the subject and date of the reliefs, *AJA* 38. 137. The London example has lost the figure of a woman from the couch, but is alone in representing the palm-tree (which suggests Alexandria). For other examples of hangings see Schreiber 50, 60, 62, 70, 86, 96, and cf. Studniczka 68.

feasts its eyes only, is playing that part; perhaps when they depart the guests, like those in Catullus, will arrive, and priests and notables, as Glotz suggested (p. 182), will take their places, it may be with the Queen herself, at the spread tables. And if guess we must, I prefer so to think of it. Like the divine pair, the guests, real or imaginary, will need their arbours, and that I take to be the explanation of T.'s plural in 119. Some of the tables of viands will be in them, and there will be couches, each to hold two persons,¹⁰⁰ splendid no doubt, but overshadowed in magnificence by that of Aphrodite and Adonis.

Finally the musical performance, of which Gorgo speaks as though it were a regular part of the ritual.¹⁰¹ Is it the crowning moment of the day,




FIG. 7.—HELLENISTIC RELIEF IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

or will it be repeated at intervals? if repeated, will the same singer go through the performance again or others take her place? and what relation does the hymn in T. bear to anything sung at Arsinoe's celebration? These questions, like the last, are beyond conclusive answer, and I must content myself with mentioning one or two points which bear upon them.

When Gorgo says (26) 'It's time to be going' we might infer that she wished to be at the palace by a particular hour in order not to miss the performance. The inference, however, would be rash, for she has also Diokleidas's dinner to think of (147), and if the hymn we hear is the culminating point of the entertainment, why has the old woman (60) come away before it began? Here there is perhaps a hint in 98. When Gorgo

¹⁰⁰ Studniczka 122.

¹⁰¹ I take τὸν Ἀδωνιν αἰεῖν (96) to mean *sing*

the Adonis-hymn (like ὁ Αἶνος, ὁ Αἰνέσις, etc.), not *sing about Adonis*.

tells us that the singer πέρυσιν τὸν ἰάλεμον ἀρίστευσε, it is natural to suppose that she refers to the lamentations on the following day of the Adonia (135), and her verb seems to imply that there has been a competition in dirge-singing, or at least that there were several solo-singers. It is an easy supposition, for Ptolemy Philadelphus was notoriously φιλόμουσος,¹⁰² and if it is right, we may well suppose that this year there is a similar competition or succession in hymns and that the singers perform, in turn and at intervals, throughout the day. At 97, we may then think, Gorgo, who is more enterprising than her friend in attending such shows (21-6), recognises in the performer whose turn it chances to be an artiste she has heard before; the old woman will have heard a previous singer.

The hymn itself is a mediocre piece. It begins well enough, but its insistence on the riches and splendour of the display is not devoid of vulgarity, and the catalogue of heroes who do not share Adonis's privileges is clumsy and perfunctory.¹⁰³ Here, however, it may be said that T., like other Alexandrians, is impeccable neither in taste nor in workmanship, that the insistence on riches is in the circumstances inevitable, and its vulgarity less (for instance) than that displayed by Callimachus at *H.* 4. 260 ff. (*cf.* 2. 32 ff., 3. 110 ff.), and, in short, that T. may well have meant the piece to be worthy of the occasion on which it was produced. He may; but the hymn is professedly composed as well as performed by the singer,¹⁰⁴ whose forte, we may suppose, is rather singing than composing, and since it is not to be imagined that T. has inserted in his poem a hymn really sung on the occasion, he may as well, or better, have written it not by his standards, but by hers. If the result is passable, as it is, the fact that it is not a masterpiece is no reflection on the munificence of Arsinoe, especially if we may regard it as one item, perhaps the worst, submitted in a competition; and the extravagant commendations of 'the incorrigible Gorgo' are more amusing and more in keeping with her character if they are bestowed upon a work which, to a more cultivated taste, does not deserve them. The 'Argive woman's daughter' (97) may well have been a real person, but she cannot have been a person of consequence whom T. would have hesitated to quiz;¹⁰⁵ and, after all, if that was her style, she is more likely, supposing she ever heard of the matter, to have been flattered than offended.

¹⁰² 14. 61, 17. 112, *cf.* Ath. 7. 276B.

¹⁰³ The clumsiness of Πελοπηιάδαι (142) after Ἀγαμέμνων (137), who is one of them, has been observed. I do not know what commentators understand by Ἀργεὺς ἄκρα Πελασγοί. The Peloponnesian Argos had a king Pelasgos, and Euripides at any rate regarded it as Pelasgian (*Or.* 692, 857, 960, 1247, 1296, *I.A.* 1498; *cf.* Call. *H.* 5. 4), but its earlier kings are a sad anticlimax after the Pelopids. If we think rather of Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος in Thessaly, the ἄκρα of which were the Aeacids, they are indeed a worthy match for Pelopids, but they are open here to the same criticism as the Pelopids, for Pyrrhus has already been separately

mentioned.

It should perhaps be added that the list of Simonides's Thessalian patrons at 16. 34 ff. is open to some similar criticism though T. has there more excuse.

¹⁰⁴ 146, *cf.* CQ 29. 71.

¹⁰⁵ A. J. Reinach's fancy (for it is no more) that she was Belestiche (*Rev. Et. Anc.* 9. 250) has naturally found few adherents. I do not know why Wilamowitz (*Hell. Dicht.* 1. 83) calls her a Samian, unless from some confused recollection of 2. 146 where Lobeck's Σαμίας was once more popular than it is now.

V. *The Improvidence of Diokleidas*

18

Γ. χῶμὸς ταυτᾶ ἔχει · φθόρος ἀργυρίῳ Διοκλείδῃ·
 ἑπταδράχμῳ κυνάδας, γραιῶν ἀποτίλματα πηρᾶν,
 πέντε πόκῳς ἔλαβ' ἐχθές, ἅπαν ῥύπον, ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ.

Before the wool can be spun it has to be washed in hot water to remove natural impurities, spread out to dry, and beaten and picked over to clear it of the foreign substances which have survived the washing.¹⁰⁶ Diokleidas's imprudent purchase¹⁰⁷ is full of such impurities, and will require extra labour before it is fit to use. Gorgo's metaphorical criticisms are less clear in meaning. *Κυνάδας* seems to imply that the wool is coarse in quality and probably short in staple, like dog's hair: ¹⁰⁸ γραιῶν ἀποτίλματα πηρᾶν, if, as is usually supposed, the words mean *pluckings of old wallets*,¹⁰⁹ perhaps suggests a picture of the sheep from which the fleeces came. Their wool will have been falling out, and they will have had bare patches of skin like a skin-pouch worn bald and shiny with use. In brief the wool is dirty, short in quantity, and poor in quality.

Wool in Egypt, unless it was sold on the sheep's back,¹¹⁰ was usually sold not by the fleece, but by weight. Fortunately, however, one of the Zenon papyri¹¹¹ gives the weights of parcels of 41, 31 and 10 fleeces as 81, 60 and 21½ minae respectively, so that the average weight of a fleece would seem to have been 2 minae. The Zenon papyri provide also the following prices: 510 minae at 340 dr., 15 mn. at 30 dr., 30 mn. at 68 dr.¹¹² Evidently for wool of such quality as Gorgo's we must take the first and lowest rate; and if we assume that the 5 fleeces weighed 10 minae, we shall find that at that (apparently wholesale) price they were worth 6 dr. 4 ob.—only 2 ob. less than Diokleidas paid. No doubt the quality of the wool may have been worse and the weight of the fleeces less than those recorded in the papyri, but it does not look as though Diokleidas's improvidence will be

¹⁰⁶ Ar. *Lys.* 574, Blümner, *Techn.*² 1.106.

¹⁰⁷ λαμβάνειν means simply *to buy* (Ar. *Pac.* 1263, *Ran.* 1235, *Nub.* 1395: see Kock on *Phryn. fr.* 51). There is therefore no suggestion in the verb that the dealer has foisted an inferior article on him. Presumably it has the same meaning at 8 since there is no sufficient evidence that it can mean *rent* or *hire*.

¹⁰⁸ οἷον κύνεια, τραχέα schol. The noun implied will be τρίχας, not δοράς (which would be easier), for πόκοι are fleeces, not sheepskins, and ἀποτίλματα wool or hair, not hide.

¹⁰⁹ I cannot say that I am very happy about this, but I have no convincing alternative to offer. The figure would be more intelligible if plucking were a process to which either wallets or sheep were normally subject, but wallet-plucking is unknown to me, and though ὑποδίφθερα, *oves pellitae* (sheep whose wool was so valuable that it was protected by hides), seem to have been plucked, not shorn (*Ann. Serv. Ant. de l'Égypte* 24. 42)—apparently in the belief

that this process improved the subsequent growth of wool (Arist. *Probl.* 893 a 17; cf. Varro, *R.R.* 2. 11. 9, Plin. *N.H.* 8. 191), Gorgo's thoughts are far removed from such refinements. Vollgraff (*Mnem.* 47. 355) thought that πήρα was slang for an old sheep; and since it has occurred independently to Professor Beazley, I will not conceal a suspicion I have occasionally entertained that it was slang for something very different (see *CR* 36. 109 with Lucil. 73, 623 Marx, Mart. 10. 90).

For our present purpose the scholium ποκάρια γεγρακότων προβάτων, whatever its relation to the text, is probably a fair approximation to the meaning.

¹¹⁰ Guéraud, *Ἐντεύξεις* 2: 4 dr. 5¼ ob. per sheep; the date is 218 B.C. and prices had risen.

¹¹¹ *Ann. Serv. Ant.* 24. 43.

¹¹² p. Cair. Zen. 59784, Zen. Mich. 61, Cair. Zen. 59398. Mr. C. C. Edgar told me of an unpublished Zenon papyrus with 15 mn. at 20 dr. His statement on p. Zen. Mich. 61 that the price is there 3 ob. per mina is a slip.

disastrous to a household whose mistress's friend can pay 200 dr. for a dress-length.

Incidentally it is now plain, as in Gorgo's explosive wording it is not, that 7 dr. is the price paid for the parcel, not per fleece; 7 dr. per fleece would be so outrageous a price, even for the best, that if he paid it at all, what he got for the money would be of no consequence.

A. S. F. Gow

*Trinity College,
Cambridge.*

A SYBARITE HIMATION

WE would gladly give the mediocre textiles preserved in South Russian graves,¹ if Fate had spared a masterpiece of Greek tapestry which we know only from description. It leads a shadowy existence in handbooks, and one can hardly say that recent papers² mark any advance towards its precise interpretation.

(1) Aristotle, *de miris auscult.* 96, 838a.

Ἄλκισθένης* τῷ Συβαρίτῃ φασὶ κατασκευασθῆναι ἱμάτιον τοιοῦτον τῇ πολυτελείᾳ, ὥστε προτίθεσθαι αὐτὸ ἐπὶ Λακινίῳ τῇ πανηγύρει τῆς Ἡρας, εἰς ἣν συμπορεύονται πάντες Ἰταλιῶται, τῶν τε δεικνυμένων μάλιστα πάντων ἐκείνο θαυμάζεσθαι· οὐ φασὶ κυριεύσαντα Διονύσιον τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἀποδόσθαι Καρχηδονίοις ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι ταλάντων. ἦν δ' αὐτὸ μὲν ἄλουργές, τῷ δὲ μεγέθει πεντεκαίδεκάπηχυ, ἐκατέρωθεν δὲ διείληπτο ζῳδίοις ἐνυφασμένοις, ἄνωθεν μὲν Σούσοις, κάτωθεν δὲ Πέρσαις· ἀνὰ μέσον δὲ ἦν Ζεὺς, Ἥρα, Θέμις, Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἀπόλλων, Ἀφροδίτη. παρὰ δ' ἐκάτερον πέρας Ἀλκισθένης† ἦν, ἐκατέρωθεν δὲ Σύβαρις.

* Ἀλκισθένης *ulg.*; Ἀντιμένει G; Ἀλκιμένει coniecit Westermann.

† Ἀλκισθένης G, *ulg.*; Ἀντισθένης CEFHL Ald.; Ἀλκιμένης Westermann.

(2) Athen. xii, 541 a, b quotes as far as ταλάντων (with the lectio Ἀλκισθένης) and adds: ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ Πολέμων περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ περὶ τῶν ἐν Καρχηδόνι πέπλων.

Let us tell the history of the himation backwards. In the early second century B.C. it was in Carthage, and was mentioned or described by Polemon in his catalogue of peploi there; it does not matter to us whether the periegetes saw it himself, or described it following a writer of Sikelika, or both. Before it came to Carthage, it was owned by Dionysius the Elder, who was a lover and connoisseur of textiles. We are told that in 388-7 B.C. he sent choice pieces from the Royal collection to Olympia,³ and

¹ CR 1878-9, pl. IV ff. The most interesting piece is the painted woollen cover from the sixth mound of the kurgan of the Seven Brothers, with mythological scenes and inscriptions, pl. IV; it is figured also by Bieber, *Gr. Kleidung*, fig. 10b. Date 430-20: Jacobsthal, *Orn. Gr. Vasen*, p. 148, n. 281; Schefold, *RM* 46, 1931, p. 120, and *ESA* XII, p. 17. For the piece with assyrianising birds (pl. V, 2), Bieber, *loc. cit.*, fig. 10, see Jacobsthal, *loc. cit.*, and Beazley, *Der Panmler*, p. 26.

Superior in quality, and of the greatest historical interest for the contact between China and the West, are the textiles from Noin-Ula in Mongolia: Borovka, *AA* 41, 1926, pp. 341 ff.; *Scythian Art*, pl. 73-4; *Die Antike* 3, 1927, pp. 64 ff.; Alföldi, *AA* 46, 1931, pp. 393 ff. They are dated to 2 B.C. or thereabouts

by the Chinese inscription engraved on the foot of the lacquer bowl found with them (fig. in *Ausstellung Chinesischer Kunst*, Berlin 1929, Cat. no. 1255; O. Kümmel, *AA* 42, 1927, p. 451). It is a matter of discussion, however, whether the embroidery with the Scythian horsemen (*Die Antike*, *loc. cit.*, pl. 8 = *AA* 41, 1926, p. 357) is not of earlier date—fourth century B.C. or so.

² Dugas, *BCH* 34, 1910, p. 116; Roes, *ibid.*, 59, 1935, p. 324. I have had the opportunity of discussing the problems with competent friends in or near Christ Church; I am especially grateful to J. D. Beazley; I owe copious information to F. Jacoby; I am indebted to A. S. F. Gow and A. J. B. Wace for useful additions.

³ Diodorus XIV, 109, 1.

Timaios⁴ criticises the showy ἐκφράσεις of textiles in the tragedies of Dionysius: these descriptions may have been bad imitations of such Euripidean ones as those in *Ion* 1141 ff.⁵ That he sold the himation to the Carthaginians for 120 talents⁶ will, as F. Jacoby points out to me, be one of those slanderous statements in which Sicilian historiography abounds.⁷ The himation had previously been in the treasure of Hera Lakinia, and had been on view at the feasts of the Lakinia. Dionysius ransacked the sanctuary some time after 383–2 B.C.⁸

Alkisthenes⁹—or whatever his real name was—was a Sybarite; his citizenship was indicated by his association with the town-goddess on the garment and by the inscriptions on it.¹⁰ The question when Alkisthenes lived and when the himation was made is best answered by an interpretation of the subject depicted. The history of Sybaris by no means compels us to give the man and his cloth an archaic date.¹¹ For after the destruction of the old town in 510 B.C., the Sybarites, with unsurpassed tenacity, tried to keep their community alive, and built up again and again what they had lost.¹² There were first Sybaris on the Traeis, in existence between 510 and 443 B.C.¹³; secondly, the short-lived Sybaris on the Krathis 453–48 B.C. again destroyed by the Crotoniates; thirdly, the early period of Thurii, founded in 444–3 B.C., when the town was still called Sybaris¹⁴; fourthly—if one can trust Pausanias (VI, 19, 9) and if he has not made a mistake over the name—Sybaris between Brundisium and Hydruntum.¹⁵ Thus Alkisthenes was a citizen of one of these Sybareis.

⁴ Polybius XII, 24, 3.

⁵ See p. 210, n. 29.

⁶ Roughly the equivalent of £32,500 gold, or the pay of 3250 mercenaries for ten months.

⁷ I refrain from discussing the utterly dark question of the sources of Pseudo-Aristotle, Polemon and Athenaeus and their affiliation, as it is of minor importance to us. All we can take for granted is that the Thaumasia and Polemon were both using some writer of Sikelika; whether the same, it is hard to say, as we do not know what Polemon said about the appearance of the himation. What one would really like to know is whether, in the original context, the garment and its story were mentioned in connexion with the tyrant's hobby, or illustrated Sybaritan τρυφή, as they do in Athenaeus.

⁸ Beloch, *Gr. Geschichte* 2 III, 2, 153.

⁹ For the *variae lectiones* see above. The form Alkimenes, which has crept into some of the textbooks, is Westermann's conjecture, not based on any manuscript.

¹⁰ See below, n. 20.

¹¹ Dugas, *loc. cit.* p. 120, n. 6.

¹² Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* III, 1, pp. 518 f.; Beloch, *op. cit.* II, 1, pp. 199–200; Wade-Gery, *JHS* 52, 1932, pp. 217–19, 222 and 225.

¹³ Orsi, *Boll. d'Arte*, 1919–20, p. 95 ff.

¹⁴ The strongest argument is afforded by the coins with the head of Athena on the obverse and ΣΥΒΑΠΙ and the Sybarite bull on the reverse. They are discussed by Hill, *Hist. Gr. Coins*, p. 49,

Beloch, *loc. cit.*, n. 4 and Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, p. 217, n. 49. To the kindness of Mr. E. S. G. Robinson I owe the following remarks, which correct some of Beloch's statements: 'The main point is that it seems impossible that the Sybarites, after having been turned out of the joint foundation, could have continued to use types which obviously owe so much to Athenian influences. Further, these coins and coins with ΘΟΥΡΙΩΝ are so close in style and even in mint-mark (e.g., the secret letter on the flank of the bull), that it is very difficult to believe they were not struck in the same mint. The difficulty is that there are coins of Thurium which, at first sight, might appear to be slightly earlier than the coins with the name Sybaris, but this is the kind of accident which is not unknown elsewhere. As regards the detail of Beloch's note, the coins with the name of Sybaris are so scarce that the period during which they were struck need not have been more than a year or so. He cannot be right, either, in saying that the reason why only small silver was struck was that the Athenian tetradrachm was the current unit, for these coins are subdivisions, not of the Attic standard, but of the Achaean standard in use at old Sybaris and neighbouring cities. It is the same standard which the people of Thurium used throughout their history.'

¹⁵ Philip, *RE*, s.v. Sybaris. Mr. T. J. Dunbabin convincingly points out to me that the statement of Pausanias deserves no *fides*.



FIG. 1.—ETRUSCAN PICTURED GARMENT FROM THE FRANÇOIS TOMB.

The cloth was a himation; Polemon might well include it in his catalogue of peploi, peplos being the term for garments of any description. The given figure of fifteen cubits, roughly 6.6 metres or 21 feet 10 inches, refers to its largest extension, its breadth. The nature and arrangement of the pictures point to a rectangle, broader than high, but we have no means of finding out the height in cubits. There is an old, odd mistake¹⁶ that the large cloth was made by the 'artist' 'Alkisthenes' to adorn the cult-statue of Hera Lakinia: the 'secular' and 'personal' character of the representation, as we shall see, definitely excludes such a use; it would have been ὕβρις. We have no reason to doubt that the himation, before it went to the Lakinian treasure, was worn by Alkisthenes, although this does not exclude its having been used to decorate klinai, walls or tents, whether for profane or ritual purposes. When he was wearing it and displaying his life in pictures on his body, he had to fold it double. That the effect of folds and folding on the continuity and completeness of the pictures did not offend people's taste is shown by representations of picture-garments in sculpture, as Despoina's embroidered veil from Lykosura,¹⁷ or in Etruscan wall-paintings¹⁸ (Fig. 1), or on vases like the London kotyle by Makron and the Talos or Pronomos kraters.

The decoration of the himation¹⁹ consisted of a main zone, subdivided into the central mythological picture and two side-pictures, each of them with Alkisthenes and Sybaris, and of an upper and lower border. There must have been inscriptions throughout:²⁰ how else should people have identified Sybaris or the cities of Susa and Persepolis?

The mythological scene has always been rightly referred to the beginning of the Kypria.²¹ From the only picture of the story preserved—the Kerch pelike in Leningrad (Fig. 2), painted in Athens at the beginning of the second half of the fourth century B.C.²²—it differs in the selection of gods present: Zeus, Athena, Aphrodite, Themis appear on both; Hera and Apollo are missing on the vase, and Peitho, Hermes, Selene on the garment.

On either side of the Kypria scene Alkisthenes and Sybaris were to be seen; we are not told what they were doing and how they were behaving. They can hardly have been standing idle side by side without contact and action, like *e.g.* Alexander, Ptolemy, Arete, Priapus and Corinthus on the chariot in the famous procession.²³ One thinks of Sybaris crowning

¹⁶ Stephani. *CR* 1863, p. 53; 1878–9, p. 104; Rossbach, *RE*, s.v. Alkisthenes; Weniger, *ML*, 5, p. 577, line 49 speaks of a 'carpet.'

¹⁷ *JdI* 1934, p. 107 (Wace).

¹⁸ *Mon. Inst.* vi–vii, pl. 32; Martha, *L'Art Etrusque*, fig. 172; *CIE* 5276; Körte, *JdI* 12, 1897, p. 60; Messerschmidt, *JdI* 45, 1930, p. 62; *Nekropole von Vulci*, pl. 11.

¹⁹ ἑκατέρωθεν δὲ διεληπτο ζωδίοις: Democritus of Ephesus (Athen. XII, 525c), in his description of the Artemision, not written before the third century B.C., gives a list of luxurious garments, among them κεφαλαί (?) κατ' ἰσά διελημμέναι ζωδίοις. See Studniczka, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen*

Tracht, p. 22, n. 64.

²⁰ One inscribed textile of pre-Roman date is preserved, the piece mentioned in n. 1. Many of the garments in the Brauronian treasure had inscriptions: ἐπιγραφον, ἀνεπιγραφον, γράμματα ἐνυφασμένα frequently occur in the list, see *IG* II², no. 1514 ff., *passim*. See also Buschor, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der griech. Textilkunst*, pp. 47 f.

²¹ Kinkel, *Epic. Gr. Fragm.* I, 17; Bethe, *Homer* II, ii (2. Auflage 1929), p. 153.

²² *FR*, pl. 69; Schefold, *Unters. zu den Kertscher Vasen*, no. 369, pp. 121.

²³ Kallixeinos apud Athen. v, 201c, d; Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks*, pp. 2 ff.

Alkisthenes with the stephanos awarded him by decree. I cannot find another appropriate subject for the pendant picture; δεξιῶσις, for example, as the reliefs teach us,²⁴ was reserved for the high contracting parties of equal rank and dignity, such as gods, goddesses and heroes. But there is no objection to the same scene having been repeated on either side: the correspondence of two similar groups like those on the Attic fourth-century relief²⁵ (Fig. 3), gives the central picture a good lateral frame, bridges the upper with the lower border and intensifies their tectonic function. And distinguished people during their public career used to get more than one stephanos.²⁶ In Athens the artist could have copied the relief on the stelae with the respective psephisma.²⁷

The upper border showed Susa; the lower Persepolis.²⁸ To find

²⁴ Binneboessel, *Studien zu den attischen Urkunden-reliefs*, passim.

²⁵ Athens, N.M. nos. 2952 and 2961; Walter, *Öjh*, 18, 1915, *Beiblatt*, p. 91, fig. 34. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Walter for lending me his photograph, which I reproduce here as Fig. 3.

²⁶ *RE*, s.v. Kranz, col. 1600, 11 ff.

²⁷ Binneboessel, *op. cit.*, nos. 2, 6, 55, 67, 78. See also Schöne, *Gr. Reliefs*, nos. 76, 77; Walter, *Beschreibung der Reliefs im kleinen Akropolismuseum*, nos. 10, 12, 13, 30–33, 33; *idem* in *Öjh*, *loc. cit.* It is not always possible to ascertain if the deity is putting a wreath or her hand on the head of the person honoured, and sometimes the descriptions are at variance (e.g., Binneboessel, no. 6, where she wrongly speaks of a wreath, whereas Walter's interpretation (no. 11) is correct). There is an honour-decree from a place other than Athens, to which my attention was drawn by Beazley, the Troezenian psephisma *IG* IV, 748 (= Dittenberger³ no. 162); the relief is figured in *AM* 36, 1911, p. 34, fig. 5. The Troezenians in 369 confer εὐεργεσία and πολιτεία on a Plataean, who is shewn crowned by Poseidon in the presence of Aphrodite; the pattern is apparently Attic. Of a different kind are the treaty stele *Mon. Ant.* 11, 1902, pl. 26, 3, p. 301, fig. 9, p. 495 (Reinach, *Rép. Reliefs* II, 318; Jacobsthal, *Mel. Reliefs*, p. 137) where the contracting cities, Polyrhenion and Phalassarna, are represented by their goddesses clasping hands, or the fourth-century Tegeatan honour-decree for an Athenian, who is receiving προξενία and εὐεργεσία, with a picture of Tyche and a tro-paion on top (*IG* V, 2, no. 1; I owe the reference to G. Klaffenbach), or cases such as *Inscripfen von Priene*, no. 17—shield and helmet in relief over the text of the psephisma conferring honours on Sotas, who had distinguished himself in the defence of the town against the Gauls.

May I just mention a few other στεφανώσεις of interest: (1) Alcibiades crowned by Olympias and Pythias, by Aglaophon II (Athen. xii, 534d), see Robert, *Arch. Hermeneutik*, pp. 79 and 420. (2) the Corinthian mirror in the Louvre (de Ridder, no. 1699; Pfuhl, *MuZ*, fig. 624, p. 720; *FR* ii, p. 42), showing Leukas crowning Korinthos—surely a

copy of some famous painting. Did it commemorate some event of the years of the foundation of the Corinthian League? (3) To a lower and more private sphere belongs the picture on a hydria, formerly in the Caputi collection (*AdI* 1876, pl. D, E; Richter, *Craft of Ath. Pottery*, p. 71; Beazley, *AT*, p. 250, no. 30—recently attributed by him to the Leningrad Painter), which is a work of the fifties or sixties of the fifth century. The painter portrays himself crowned by Athena—εἶθε μοι χρυσοῦς στέφανος γένοιτο—a vain desire which life has hardly satisfied. (4a) Polybius V, 88: 'ἔστησαν ἀνδρίαντας ἐν τῷ τῶν Ροδίων δειγματι στεφανούμενον τὸν δῆμον τῶν 'Ροδίων ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Συρακοσίων.' The group was erected after the fatal earthquake in 227 or 226 B.C., see Hiller von Gaertringen, *RE*, suppl. V, col. 785; Robert, *Arch. Herm.* p. 420, note to p. 77. (4b) Demosthenes, *de Corona*, 91: στέσαι δὲ καὶ εἰκόνας τρεῖς ἑκαταδεκαπάχεις ἐν τῷ Βοσπορείῳ, στεφανούμενον τὸν δῆμον τὸν 'Αθηναίων ὑπὸ τῷ δάμῳ τῶν Βυζαντιῶν καὶ Περινήϊων (in 339 B.C.).

If the psephisma is a forgery the striking similarity with the Rhodian group seems to prove at least a Hellenistic date for it; see H. Weil, *Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène* p. 413. Dumont (*Mon. des Et. Grecques* 1873, 31) and P. Gardner (*JHS* IX, p. 61)—see *RE* V 157—believe that a fragment of a colossal bronze statue of a woman from Perinthos formed part of the group. I do not see what a statue of a woman found at Perinthos has to do with a group of three demoï which stood in Byzantium, and not at Perinthos.

²⁸ From Heyne, who first altered Σούσιος into Σουσίσιος, and Longpérier (1854) onwards, writers have been disinclined to take Susa for Susa and Persai for Persai, i.e. Persepolis. Longpérier's translation, 'Le haut représentait les animaux sacrés des Susiens, le bas ceux des Perses,' has recently been revived by Miss Roes (*loc. cit.* in note 2), who, 'risquant l'indignation des fervents de l'archéologie classique,' thinks that there were to be seen two types of those monsters with two bodies and one head. But, as any dictionary teaches, ζῶον and ζῶδιον are frequently used for figures of any kind. On Amasis' linen cuirasses (Herod. II, 182 and III,

a picture of a town on a fifth-century monument is not altogether surprising. Good examples of what classical tapestry was able to picture are the parapetasmata of the Delphian tent described by Euripides²⁹



FIG. 2.—KERCH PELIKE IN LENINGRAD. THE KYPRIA.

47)—in the sanctuaries of the Samian Hera and of the Rhodian Athana Lindia (Chr. Blinkenberg, *La Chronique du Temple Lindien C*, 36) *ζῶα ἐνυφασμένα συχνά*, which need not be animal friezes, see Buschor, *Textilkunst*, p. 43. Strong indirect proofs are *ζωγράφος*, *ζωγραφία*, etc. *ζωγράφος* first occurs in Herodotus II, 46,5 but *ζωγραφήματα* is as old as sixth century (Kranz, *Hermes*, 1938, 118) see also *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Index). In Empedocles 128, 5, . . . εὐσεβέεσσι ἀγάλμασιν . . . γραπτοῖς τε ζῷοις, γραπτοῖς τε ζῷοις is the metric translation of *ζωγραφίαις*. *ζωφόρος* will be also a fifth-century word, although the Erechtheum inscriptions *IG I²*, 372, col. 1, 41–2 (Jahn-Michaelis, *Arx Athenarum*, p. 100) and *IG I²*, 374c, col. 2, 38 ff. (Jahn-Michaelis, p. 108) do not use it. By mere chance the term occurs for the first time in Vitruvius 3, 5, 10 and 4, 1, 2; but *πίνακας παραλλήλους ζωφόρους τέτταρας ἴσους τοῖς τοίχοις* in Hieronymus of Kardia's description of the bier of Alexander (Diod. 18, 26) is equivalent (see Müller, *Leichenwagen Alexanders*, p. 63, and Wilamowitz, *JdI*, 20, 1905, p. 106).

The contrast 'Susian animals—Persian animals' is as warped as if one were to speak of 'Parisian' and 'French' ones. And was the ancient author such an expert that, like Miss Roes, he could tell Susian monsters from Persian?

To take *Πέρσης* for an adjective is a blunder, the adjective is definitely *Περσικός*. Miss Roes, following an old-fashioned dictionary, quotes two cases for an adjectival use of *Πέρσης*. Of these, the first is in the epigram by Alkaios, *Anth. Plan.* 5 (Stadtmüller, *Anth. Pal.* ad vii, 247) *Πέρσαν στρατόν*, but Pape (*Wörterbuch der Eigennamen*³, s.v. *Πέρσης*) had already corrected it to *Περσῶν στρατόν*; the second is Agatharchidas, *De mari Erythraeo* (GGM I, p. 113; *RE VI*, 593) 'ὡς ὁ Πέρσης λόγος ἐπιστώσατο.' I should give no credence to it, and I prefer to read ὡς ὁ Πέρσης ἐπιστώσατο or ὡς ὁ Περσικός λόγος ἐπιστώσατο. Dugas, *op. cit.*, p. 116 ingeniously reads 'σουσοίς,' instead of 'Σούσοις.' *σοῦσον* is a rare Greek word of oriental origin meaning lily; he thought of a frieze of lotus.

For Persai having been the earlier form of Persepolis we have good third century authorities: Berossus (apud Clem. Alex. *Protr.* V, 65, 3, Staehlin, p. 50, 5) and the source of Arrian, *Anab.* III, 18, 10. See Liddell and Scott s.v. and *RE XIX*, col. 1264, line 1. The source of Ps. Aristotle and Athenaeus is another example; and if, as is likely, "*Πέρσαι*" was written on our cloth (see n. 20) it would be our earliest evidence for the usage.

²⁹ *Ion*, 1158 ff.

in the years 420-10 B.C. And pictures of towns from the same period are preserved in Lycia—at Xanthus,³⁰ Yeulbashi,³¹ Pinara³² and Tlos.³³ Their style is Greek; Greek also is the perspective drawing, reflecting the art either of Agatharchos of Samos or Apollodorus of Athens,³⁴ but the custom of representing places is Assyrian or Persian.



FIG. 3.—ATTIC FOURTH-CENTURY PSEPHISMA RELIEF.

³⁰ *AM* 52, 1927, Beilage XIII, 5 and XIV, 2; p. 112.

³¹ Benndorf, *Das Heroon von Gjölbashi-Trysa*, pl. 12.

³² Benndorf and Niemann, *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*, i, figs. 34-7; *AM* 52, 1927, p. 141, fig. 5.

³³ Benndorf and Niemann, fig. 86; *AM* 52, 1927, p. 143, fig. 6.

³⁴ Pfuhl, *MuZ* II, 677; Schuchhardt, *AM* 52, 1927, p. 140. In the discussion of perspective drawing during the fifth century B.C., as far as I know, the most striking example has been neglected—the relief with the Persian sacrifice from Erghili (Daskylion) in Istanbul (Mendel, no. 1357; *BCH* 1913, p. 348, pl. 8). It is of provincial Ionian style

The degree of perspective in those pictures varies; that from Pinara (Fig. 4) is the simplest and will give us the best idea of the appearance of the Persian towns on the Sybarite himation. If Susa and Persepolis were little more than long lines of a crenellated city-wall with crenellated towers

of the last quarter of the century. Macridy and Mendel, trying to accord the relief with Strabo's description of the Persian rite (XV, 3, 14) took the construction between the priests and the door for a pyre (bucher de brindilles—botte de branchages). A pyre consists of logs, loosely piled up, to give draught enough to the flame, as shewn by the following more or less elaborate pictures: (1) Myson's Croesus amphora in the Louvre (G 97 FR, pl. 113; Beazley, *AI*, p. 97, 1). (2) Pelike in Munich (FR, pl. 109, 2; Beazley, *AI*, p. 452, 3), in the manner of the Kadmos Painter—same construction of pyre, but the logs have already fallen asunder: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πυρὸς ἄνθος ἀπέπτωτο, παύσατο δὲ φλόξ (*Iliad*, 9, 212; this excellent variant, read by Aeschylus, *Prom.* 7 and the Orphic poets (Abel, fragm. 291) has been wrongly rejected on Aristarchus' authority). (3) An Attic krater (Gerhard, *Ant. Bildwerke*, pl. 31; Milani, *Mito di Filottete* I, 3; Baumeister, *Denkmäler* I, p. 307; FR II, p. 257), which Beazley assigns to a painter whose chief work is London F 64 (*Mem. Linc.* 6th ser., I, pl. 31, 1). (4) Python's Alkmene vase (London F 149; Trendall, *Paestan Pottery*, pl. 15, p. 56). (5) Tarentine volute krater in Naples, no. 3254 (FR, pl. 89). (6) Etruscan cista in London (Walters no. 638; *JdI*, 45, 1930, p. 73). (7) Tabula Iliaca. O. Jahn, *Griechische Bilderchroniken*, pl. I, I*, p. 24: the pyre of Patroklos, very sketchily rendered.

But here we have definitely a pen, made of reed-stalks, given a solid foundation by a wooden beam on the ground, and held by wooden poles, inside and outside of which only the latter are visible. I am not convinced that the heads of the victims are already cut off: their eyes are open like those of living animals and not closed as those of the sacrificed ram on the Nekyia krater in the Bibl. Nat. (FR, pl. 60; Trendall, *Fruhitaliotische Vasen*, pl. 16, no. 238). The beasts are lying down and their heads look over the wall. I have asked Dr. Dorner to check my interpretation, based on study of photographs, and, after examination of the original, he confirms its correctness; furthermore, he agrees that the plastic rendering of the animals ends at the right outline of the heads; where one expects the fleecy neck of the sheep, the background is roughed; no doubt the artist used colour here, as he did for the details of the door-console.

The horizontal lines of the stalks converge to the left, and the intervals between the actually equidistant poles decrease towards the left; the head of the sheep is done on a considerably smaller scale than that of the bull. This is the most radical case of skiagraphia in classical art. See Delbrueck,

Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Linearperspektive, pp. 41 ff.; Jolles, *Vitruvs Aesthetik*, pp. 70, 74, 86; Pfuhl, *JdI* 25, 1910, p. 21.

May I say a word on the shape of the door? It has its closest analogy in the door on the Thasian relief in the Louvre (Rayet, *Monuments de l'art antique*, I, pl. 22; BrBr, pl. 61) the construction of which has been discussed by Studniczka, *ÖJh* 6, 1903, p. 172. The console—οὔς (Klenk, *Die antike Tür* (Diss. Giessen 1924) p. 43)—is of exaggerated size; only its outline is sculptured, the details were painted. Its form is very similar to that of the door-consoles on Locrian reliefs (*Ausonia* III, pp. 141, 143, 209). The console on the Thasian relief correctly renders preserved architectural models as the Erechtheum-door or that of the Lycian fourth-century Amyntas grave (Benndorf und Niemann, *op. cit.*, I, p. 41, fig. 29), whereas the Daskylion and Locrian reliefs turn it sideways 90 degrees. This is either a licence of projection or the rendering of another architectural reality: I am inclined to believe the former.

The consoles of tables, attached to the leg, supporting the tapering end of the table-top, resemble our door-consoles. But here the profile-view on reliefs and vases corresponds to reality and construction. Examples of such table-legs preserved are figured by Richter, *Ancient Furniture*, fig. 204, 206A; an elaborate representation is to be seen on the Thasian relief in Istanbul, Mendel 587; *JdI* 28, 1913, pl. 26; Rodenwaldt, *Griechisches Relief*, fig. 87; Richter, *op. cit.*, fig. 205. Miss Richter (fig. 357) gives a reconstruction. That the table scroll-console is an ornamental development of a simple angular projection is best shown by Etruscan miniature tables such as Berlin, Neugebauer, *Führer Bronzen*, pl. 28, p. 31 (Richter, *op. cit.*, fig. 197) and the piece in London, Walters, *BM Bronzes*, no. 448 (Richter, *op. cit.*, fig. 198). The consoles of the kyliouchia on Locrian reliefs present a more difficult problem. Examples are: *Ausonia*, III, pp. 193, 195, 216, 227; *Mon. Ann. Boll.*, 1856, pl. 28 (facing p. 114); Stackelberg, *Graber der Hellenen*, p. 42 (Studniczka, *Das Symposium Ptolemaios II*, fig. 49); Studniczka, *ibid.*, fig. 48; *B.M. Guide Greek and Roman Life*, p. 36, fig. 26 (Richter, *op. cit.*, fig. 229); Richter, fig. 242. These chests are very detailed pictures of noble Greek furniture. The large consoles, supporting the projecting part of the top table, have to be taken for real; their side-view may have corresponded to that of the Amyclaeon console-capitals *JdI* 33, 1918, pl. 8-9, p. 147, whereas the little consoles under the lintel of the sham doors offer the same alternative as the door-consoles on the Daskylion and Locrian reliefs.




FIG. 4.—TOWN PICTURES FROM PINARA.




FIG. 5.—MOSAIC WITH CRENELLATED BORDER.

at equal intervals, then they were well suited to the necessarily ornamental character of narrow borders: so well, indeed, that they came near the battlement pattern frequently used as a border to textiles and mosaics (Fig. 5): one might almost speak of a πυργωτὸν ἱμάτιον.³⁵

The himation is an autobiography in pictures: Alkisthenes was twice represented as being honoured by the town-goddess: '... ἐπαινέσαι μὲν Ἀλκισθένην <τοῦ δαίνα> ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκα . . . καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον.'

It is natural to refer the other pictures also to his life and career. If we knew more about the vicissitudes of those unhappy places which, one after the other, kept alive the name and memory of the vanished great city, we should probably be able to see, as Alkisthenes' fellow-citizens certainly did, that even the great mythological show in the central field was but a transparent simile, the projection into Olympus of some successful motion proposed by the clever Alkisthenes: 'ἔδοξε τῷ βωλῶ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ Ἀλκισθένης <τοῦ δαίνα> εἶπεν.'

But why did the Sybarite depict on his garment the Persian capitals? Had he, like so many Greeks, tried his fortunes in Persia, as an artist, engineer or doctor? Or did his political career and ambition lead him to Susa and Persepolis, with the fantastic scheme of enlisting the Persians into one of those Sybaritan adventures?

It is not easy to assess this curious document. There is certainly a note of Trimalchian ἀλαζονεία³⁶ in the disproportion between the deeds of the philistine Sybarite and the grandiose symbols. Trimalchio's shameless abuse of the Olympian apparatus for autobiographical purposes follows Hellenistic examples. And may we not recognise here also, in the arrogant use of such a garment, and in the naïve yet pretentious mixing of mortals with gods, an anticipation of Diadochan manners?

One might imagine that in Persia Alkisthenes had become acquainted with this sort of historical tapestry, and had then ordered one for himself at Thurii or Tarentum.

P. JACOBSTHAL.

*Christ Church,
Oxford.*

³⁵ χιτωνίσκος πυργωτός occurs in the middle fourth-century list of clothes in the Brauronion IG II², nos. 1514, 26: 1515, 18; 1516, 5, 23; 1517, 152. The mosaics imitating this textile pattern are mentioned by Studniczka, *Das Symposion Ptolemaios II*, 53. The variant shown by the cloth CR 1878-9, pl. 5, 5, which might well be called πυργωτὸν, is extremely common in tapestries of many countries and periods. The close connexion of tapestries and mosaics is a well-known fact, but proved cases are rare. I know only one: the mosaic in London, Hinks, *Cat. of Paintings and Mosaics*, fig. 87, is very similar to the Hellenistic embroidery from Noin-Ula in Mongolia. *Die Antike* 3, 1927, pl. 8 (A.1 41, 1926, pp. 359-60, fig. 10); Borovka's comparisons of motives with some of the South Russian mosaics

(A.1 41, 1926, pp. 352-3 and 357) are erroneous.

³⁶ I have repeatedly discussed the difficult point with my friends: Beazley looks at the man with Petronian eyes and quotes his favourite writer's chapter 29: 'non destiti totum parietem persequi. erat autem venalicium cum titulis pictum, et ipse Trimalchio capillatus caduceum tenebat Minervae ducente Romam intrabat. hinc quemadmodum ratiocinari didicisset, denique dispensator factus esset, omnia diligenter curiosus pictor cum inscriptione reddiderat, in deficiente vero iam porticu levatum mento in tribunal excelsum Mercurius rapiebat. praesto erat Fortuna cornu abundanti copiosa et tres Parcae aurea pensa torquentes.' Ed. Fraenkel stresses the other aspect of Alkisthenes as a 'condottiere in "Persian" costume.'

POSTSCRIPT

After my paper was written, but before publication, I had the good fortune to discuss it with H. T. Wade-Gery. His trenchant arguments and stimulating objections need careful consideration, and I feel it would be unfair to the reader if I ended my paper here without putting them before him. Our controversy on the date, however, will not affect what I think to be the most important result—my interpretation of the top and bottom friezes as town pictures³⁷ and of the whole as a historical document. Wade-Gery's start was the obvious reflexion—is not the splendour and the conscious pride too much for a later Sybaris? His question is so natural that one feels compelled to re-examine seriously what former writers had naïvely assumed: was not Alkisthenes a citizen of the old town, and was not the cloth made before 510 B.C.? But this is a question, and a question only: if in the end Alkisthenes should turn out to have been a citizen of one of those refoundations, history—most likely in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries A.D.—might provide analogies for such disproportion in size between deeds and expression. And could one not also say: 'Kleine Hunde bellen am lautesten?'

Let us try to build the pictures out of archaic material.

(1) The Kypria. There is no difficulty in arranging the gods after the Corneto Oltos cup (Beazley, *AV*, p. 15, no. 49). Wade-Gery (*Greek Poetry and Life, Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, pp. 72-4, 77-8) had pointed out himself that the Epic poems were indeed unfamiliar in the West till the very end of the sixth century; but Alkisthenes was obviously a travelled man, and knew the Eastern world better than most Westerners.

(2) Susa and Persepolis. Troy on the François vase gives a fairly good model—although there is a difference between a partial picture of a fortress, of a palace (house of Peleus) or of a krene—requisites of the story told—and a representation of a town, presumably without figures, as an end in itself, on the Sybarite garment.

The representation of Persepolis gives us a positive, well-defined *terminus post quem*: it was not before the years 518-15 B.C. that Darius began to build the new capital (Herzfeld in *Journ. Royal Asiatic Soc.* 1934, p. 229)—a very narrow limit indeed for the origin of the himation! (See below.)

Sybaris: Wade-Gery asks: Why should Sybaris not be a town like Susa and Persepolis? The puzzling problem is that Alkisthenes is represented *twice*. Such duplication would be no problem if we had to do with an Etruscan work, for the Etruscans did not only tolerate repetition, but were even fond of it (Robert, *Arch. Herm.*, p. 288; J. D. Beazley and F. Magi, *La Raccolta B. Guglielmi nel Museo Gregoriano*, p. 76). But here, if Sybaris was just a town and 'background,' it is hard to see what Alkisthenes alone was doing on the right and on the left; my interpretation tries to find two different situations, making good pendants, but avoiding

³⁷ F. von Lorentz, *RM* 52, 1937, 204 ff., in a study on ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ ΥΦΑΣΜΑΤΑ, published when my paper was already with the printers, has independently come to the same result.

mere repetition. So I was led to my suggestion that there were to be seen two στεφανώσεις, two honours conferred upon him at different times. If Wade-Gery is right about an archaic date, Sybaris as a town-goddess would be out of question, she could only be a local deity, a nymph, or a river-god;³⁸ but I am at a loss to find two different situations in which she could be acting with Alkisthenes.

To sum up: one can neither exclude an archaic nor prove a later date with mathematical evidence. But at the points just mentioned the weakness or strength of the pros and cons seems to become especially perceptible: the building of Persepolis had been begun between the years 518 and 515 B.C. (see above). If one considers how little, according to the inscriptions, had been completed under the reign of Darius (see Herzfeld, *l.c.*; *RE*, xix, col. 1266 ff.), it is extremely unlikely that in 510 B.C. the town was already depicted by a Greek in the West! It was not before Artaxerxes I (464–425/4 B.C.) that Persepolis was entirely finished and could make a stately picture. And if my interpretation of the lateral scenes should be correct, it might be another argument for the later date: as far as I can find, the earliest known psephisma with a representation of a στεφανώσις dates from 427–6 B.C. (Schöne, *Gr. Reliefs*, pl. 22, no. 96; *IG* I², no. 59.) And after all, here, as often, the whole is not the sum of its parts. Hardly less important than the weight of the details discussed is the feeling that as long as one works with the early date, all—if all—is at best possible, but not probable, while by basing the reconstruction on fifth-century material, one is treading upon smooth ground.

³⁸ *RE*, s.v. *Sybaris*, Col. 1002, F. Matz, *Die Naturpersonifikationen in der griechischen Kunst*, p. 103.

ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE 1937-1938

[PLATES XVIII, XIX.]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS are due to Professor Oikonomos and members of the Greek Archaeological Service, the Directors of the French and American Schools, the German Archaeological Institute, and of associated excavations, my colleagues of the British School and the Director of Antiquities in Cyprus, for the reports, photographs and drawings which they have generously contributed. This summary, as usual, does not exactly cover a period of twelve months. It contains all the proceedings of 1937 not already reported and a large proportion of those of 1938.

ATHENS AND ATTICA

The archaic kouros from Anavysos in Attica, the fragments of which were restored to Greece in August 1937, has been reassembled and set up in the archaic gallery of the National Museum. It is to be published by Philadelpheus in *BSA* xxxvi.

A. Raubitschek has concluded his studies of archaic inscriptions from the Acropolis, and has associated a number of statues or fragments of statues in the Acropolis Museum with their inscribed bases. Some striking instances are: (1) the connexion of the seated 'scribe' (Acropolis, no. 629) with two fragments of an Ionic pedestal (*IG* I² 548 and *IG* I² 663) previously assembled by him (*ÖJh* xxxi, *Beiblatt*, 44 ff.), and bearing a dedicatory inscription by Alkimachos, son of Chairion, known from other sources to have been a treasurer, (2) the connexion of the early classical statue of Athena (Acropolis, no. 140) with an inscribed base showing it to be the work of the sculptor Evenor, and (3) the identification of the Nike, no. 690, as the dedication of Kallimachos, the victor of Marathon, set up in his name after his death in the battle (*IG* I² 609). Raubitschek is publishing his discoveries, with the exception of the last-mentioned (which will appear elsewhere), in a forthcoming issue of the *BSA*, in an article dedicated to the memory of Humfry Payne.

The fragmentary head, probably from the south frieze of the Parthenon, which came to light three years ago (*JHS* lv, 1935, 128-9), has now been brought to Greece by Mr. A. W. Gomme and presented to the Acropolis Museum. Tests made in the Museum by Professor Ashmole make it reasonably certain that it is the missing head of the horseman numbered 44 in the British Museum publication of the Parthenon sculptures (slab xvii, S. Frieze, no. 868 in the Acropolis Museum), as was surmised in the note in *JHS*.

The excavations of the American School, under Shear's direction, in the Agora continue to yield important topographical results. Thompson,

in his further examination of the Tholos and its surroundings, has laid bare the foundations of a large complex of archaic buildings (see Plan, Fig. 1), which are likely to throw considerable light on the history of the Bouleuterion from the beginning of the sixth century to the period shortly after the Persian wars, when the Tholos appears to have been built. Some of the later buildings of the archaic complex lie beneath the Tholos itself. The large, rectangular building at the north of the complex may prove to be the Council Chamber, and its apparent date at the beginning of the sixth century, if confirmed, would associate it with the constitutional reforms of Solon. The other buildings would seem to be connected with the




FIG. 1.—PLAN OF AGORA.

administration of the Bouleuterion and the arrangement for the accommodation of the Bouleutai in the archaic period. Of particular interest are the two long, parallel pits found on the north side of the Tholos. These pits contained a large quantity of ashes, together with bones which have been identified as those of sheep, goats, cattle and deer. They were clearly roasting-pits.

Not far to the south-east from this complex of buildings was made perhaps the most interesting discovery in this year's work—an oblong boundary stone, standing on end, clearly in position and very well preserved, inscribed with the words *ἡρὸς εἰμὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς* on its broad surface towards the east. The first two words run from left to right along the upper end of this surface, and the last two descend vertically from the corner. The stone appears to have been in use for a relatively short period, perhaps fifty years, after which it seems to have been covered up by deposits of earth from the steep slope behind it to the south.

Parsons, continuing his investigation of the ancient basin of the Klepsydra, has excavated a comparatively easy entrance to the chamber through gaps in the rock on the west side, close to the south-west corner. It is now possible to see part of the structure by daylight. The floor of the basin, which was pumped dry last year, is now under water again, but the upper parts of the walls at the southern end are in view. The height of the western retaining wall of the basin is now seen to be 4 metres, instead of 5, as appeared from within. The uppermost metre is a thin parapet wall, constructed later out of used blocks, and running along the brink of the original basin. It seems that there was a paved chamber all along the west side of the basin, bounded in its turn by a wall farther west, and accessible from the north end. The whole area is, however, much disturbed, and concealed by masses of fallen cliff, and it remains to be seen how much more of it can be cleared and exposed to view.

Further investigation of the causeway leading along the line of the Valerian wall, past the Klepsydra, to the foot of the Acropolis ascent indicates the possibility that, in spite of its steep gradient, it was, after all, the main route for vehicles as well as pedestrians from the Agora to the Acropolis (cf. *JHS* lvii, 1937, 119-20).

Among individual finds from the Agora excavations are to be noted a Proto-attic oenochoe with representations of horses, a Fikellura amphora of about 525 B.C., a fine b.f. tall, conical stand with four bird and animal friezes, fragments of the neck and shoulder of a massive b.f. amphora with a centaureomachy frieze on the front, between a lotus and palmette frieze above and a row of linked buds below, and a b.f. alabastron. Another interesting fragment is a late fifth-century lintel block in Pentelic marble, with painted decoration. The left end of the block is preserved and shows the hind-quarters of a lioness moving towards the right against a background of blue. The tuft of the tail, which curves over the back, is modelled in low relief in stucco, and there are also traces of stucco on the outlines of tail and body. On the coffer beneath the lintel is a painted lotus and palmette frieze.

Broneer carried on his excavations on the north-east slopes of the Acropolis from 21st March to 18th June in three separate areas. A section of the slope was cleared directly south of the church of the Saviour, adjoining the area excavated last year.¹ The important discoveries here came from the contents of five wells, all of which appear to have been filled up in the first half of the fifth century B.C. Numerous sherds of black-figured pottery and a few red-figured pieces were recovered. Among the more noteworthy are several fragments of a large lid in the Vourva style; some pieces of an early black-figured calyx-krater in the style of Exekias; a black-figured lekythos with figures of Hera, Athena and Aphrodite, conducted by Hermes to the beauty contest of Paris; some pieces of a votive plaque with the figure of Athena holding the owl, and facing her a woman, probably a votary; and some fragments of a plate made by the potter Sotes and painted by Paideros, both unknown before. Two more fragments belonging to the calyx-krater by Exekias discovered last year were also recovered.

¹ *Hesperia* vi, 1937, pp. 469-86, and 539-70; vii, 1938, pp. 161-310; and *AJ4* xliii, 1938, pp. 161-4.



FIG. 4.—POROS STELE.


THE KERAMEIKOS.
FIG. 3.—PROTO-GEOMETRIC PNYX.

FIG. 2.—EXCAVATIONS.

The outstanding find of the year is a large poros head (Pl. XVIII), which fits the torso of Herakles in the Herakles-Triton pediment group in the Acropolis Museum.

The second area of excavation is the deep passage to the north-west of the Erechtheum, where work was begun in the spring of 1937. Traces of a stairway have been discovered leading down to an underground water supply, the level of which is *ca.* 35 metres below the Acropolis. The stairway, which dates from the late Mycenaean period, was constructed of large stone slabs resting on rubble masonry held together by a framework of wood. The decay of the wood caused the collapse of the stair, not long after its construction, and subsequently the deep hole was used as a dumping-place. Considerable quantities of potsherds have come from the fill. Near the top of the passage some classical and Geometric sherds were found, but the undisturbed fill at the lower levels contained chiefly late Mycenaean pottery with a negligible admixture of earlier sherds. A large proportion of the pottery belongs to the granary style.

The third area is a continuation of the work carried on by the American School in 1932 and 1936 in and around the large cave on the east slope of the Acropolis.² In a trench below the cave were discovered traces of a road, paved with marble slabs, of Roman construction. It runs approximately east to west in line with the approach to the Theatre of Dionysos on the east side of the cave. The trench was temporarily filled again in order to protect the pavement until the work can be continued next year.

The British School made another attack on the dump in front of the east cave of the Acropolis between 21st February and 5th March. A few unimportant pieces of bronze were found, and a number of interesting sherds, including a large fragment of a b.f. plaque, a fragment of the cup Graef-Langlotz II, pl. 10, 211, with a helmeted head, and an attractive fragment akin to the Brygos Painter, perhaps from the cup Graef-Langlotz II, pl. 15, 298. The plaque fragment shows a figure seated on a high chair, and before him a statuette of Athena. It bears an inscription not yet elucidated. No other fragment of this plaque is known.

At the Kerameikos, Kübler has excavated in the vicinity of the tomb of Hegeso, where the original ground-level falls steeply northward into the ancient bed of the Eridanos stream (Fig. 2). No fewer than forty-nine graves were found in the proto-Geometric and Geometric levels. Their contents throw much light on the chronology of the periods. There is a fine group of 'Early proto-Geometric' vases, which includes the pyxis in Fig. 3, and a great quantity of pieces belonging to the transitional period from 'Late proto-Geometric' to Geometric. The most noteworthy of post-Geometric finds in this area is the upper portion of a poros stele, the lower part of which was unearthed in 1936 (Fig. 4; see *AA* 1935, fig. 5. on p. 270), showing in relief the figure of a man with sword and staff. It is dated by Kübler shortly before the middle of the sixth century.

An examination of the Themistoclean embankment wall of the Eridanos, by the Sacred Gate, produced some important finds, including

² *Hesperia* ii, 1933, pp. 415-7; and v, 1936, pp. 247-53.

the upper half of the early archaic stele found in 1927 in another part of the wall (Buschor, *AMli*, 1926, pp. 142 ff.), a fragment of another, somewhat later poros stele, half of an Ionic poros capital, and a pointed marble stele, about 2 metres high, with a life-size figure in relief of a man holding a garland in his right hand.

The *Ekthesis* contains a more up-to-date account of the operations of Kourouniotis and Travlos in the Sacred Way and Eleusis during 1937 than was available at the time of my last summary, when they were still in progress. Travlos has completed the excavation of a small, three-chambered building, constructed of previously used blocks, in the temenos of the temple of Aphrodite. It must have accommodated ministrants or worshippers. To the east is another cluster of small buildings of the same character. The north-west corner of the temenos was located, and other parts of the surrounding wall. The section of the Sacred Way that ran past the sanctuary has been uncovered.

By the lake, about half-way across its seaward shore, a line of masonry blocks has been unearthed. These seem to belong to the ancient retaining embankment, and may also help to establish the exact site of the bridge over which the Sacred Way crossed the outlet from the lake to the sea.

The main operation at Eleusis was the excavation of the group of buildings, surrounded by a polygonal wall, opposite the south gate, known as the 'Sacred House.' The site includes traces of buildings dating from Meso-Helladic times, but its religious character seems to date from the end of the Geometric period, when a building of that period was converted into a place of worship. Sacrificial vessels containing ashes, and other, apparently votive, vases indicate that the building was used for this purpose during the seventh century. It seems to have been destroyed in the sixth century, and a small temple constructed on its site in Peisistratid times. The foundations of this temple have been identified, and tiles of the same character and of the same island marble as those of the Peisistratid Telesterion have been found. The surrounding polygonal wall appears to be of the same date.

Kourouniotis published a full account of his excavations at Eleusis in 1934.³

THE PELOPONNESE

The German Archaeological Institute carried out further important work at *Olympia* from December to the end of May under the direction of Kunze and Schleif. The main task, which will continue for some years, is a systematic excavation of the Stadion. As a preliminary, a huge trench, 5 metres wide, was dug through the site, at right angles to the course, down to the original ground level. In the walls of this trench, vertical sections of the spectators' mounds, as they existed in successive epochs, on either side of the course were clearly discernible. It also became apparent that throughout ancient times these mounds consisted of plain earth embankments, the surfaces of which were not tiered, but lay in an unbroken slope. The next

³ *Deltion* 15, Appendix pp. 1-48.

operation was to excavate the surface of the southern mound by the east of the trench, layer by layer, down to the fifth-century level. As a result of the year's work the arrangement and the history of the Stadion are already to a great extent made clear. The mound on the north was provided by the hill-side, and for that reason was always broader and steeper than that of the mound on the south, which was artificial. The earliest earthwork is dated by the excavators to about 540. It consisted of a slight modification of the natural slope on the north side, and the erection of a low mound on the south. In the fifth century, about the time that the temple of Zeus was built, wide and symmetrical mounds were constructed for the first time on



FIG. 5.—BRONZE SHIELDS AT OLYMPIA.

either side, and the Stadion acquired the shape which it maintained, essentially unaltered, throughout ancient times. Both mounds were considerably enlarged in the fourth century, the floor of the Stadion reconstructed, with a surrounding water-channel, and the bases of the mounds marked by a course of poros blocks. The floor of the Stadion, as it existed before the fourth century, is not traceable. The mounds were enlarged once more in early Imperial times. The last renovation occurred in the second century A.D. The Stadion fell into disuse after the fourth century. In later times the whole site was gradually filled up, until no depression remained on the surface to indicate where the race-track lay. The excavation also brought to light an underground channel, constructed of large poros blocks, through which the surface water escaped from the race-track to the bed of the Alpheus.

The most important finds in this area were numerous bronze weapons, nearly all archaic. Fifteen large bronze shields (Fig. 5) were discovered lying high up on the archaic southern mound. Their position leaves little doubt that they and the other weapons were set up in the Stadion as trophies and were covered over when the fifth-century reconstruction took place. These shields richly supplement the evidence regarding the construction and decoration of archaic shields, which was furnished last year by the finds in the ravine close to the north-west corner of the Stadion (*JHS* lvii, 1937, pp. 129-30). Like the earlier finds, these shields retain traces of the wooden foundation on which the bronze-work was laid, and several of them have the same bronze reliefs connecting the arm-loops with the rim of the shield, and bearing mythological scenes. One such strip, with a scene representing Herakles and Eurystheus, is of iron instead of bronze. A bronze greave bears an inscription to the effect that it was dedicated by men of Zankle as part of the spoils taken from men of Rhegium. Besides weapons, the dedications include cauldrons, tripods, etc.

Among chance finds in this area, unconnected, apparently, with the Stadion, may be mentioned a griffin protome of the third quarter of the seventh century, and a Laconian hydria handle with a female head forming the lower attachment.

The foundations of the great South Stoa, which were only partially uncovered in the earlier excavations, have now been completely excavated, and many fragments of the building itself recovered. It proves to have been a fourth-century building, repaired in Roman times. The fill contained a number of classical sherds and several large objects, including two inscriptions: the one, a tablet from a statue base, commemorates Pherias of Aegina, winner of the boy's wrestling in 464 B.C. (Paus. vi, 14, 1), and the other a knife with a dedication, in fourth-century characters, to Pan.

Minor operations at the south end of the Echo Stoa led to the discovery of an archaic deposit several metres below the Stoa itself. Besides a number of sherds and some complete vases, this deposit also contained valuable bronze finds of the eighth and seventh centuries, including a lion protome, a Protocorinthian relief with a heron, two griffins and two sphinxes, and three Corinthian helmets. These objects were found with quantities of bones and ashes, and seem to have been dumped there when the ground was being levelled for the erection of the Stoa. The deposit is not yet exhausted, and more finds may be expected from it next year.

Kyparissis, continuing the excavation of the Mycenaean cemetery on the ancient site of *Antheia* near Patras, has recovered in all nearly a hundred vases, most of them in good condition.

At *Sicyon* Orlandos has been principally engaged upon the temple of Artemis, the site of which he has cleared. The building was of soft Sicyonian stone, and probably dated from the time of Demetrios Poliorcetes. There is some evidence to show that an archaic temple existed previously on the site. The Hellenistic temple was, in its turn, destroyed by earthquakes. In Christian times a church was built upon its foundations.

At *Geraki* Nyngopoulos has been excavating the site of a basilica which,

in its earliest form, may be dated as far back as the fifth century. It was considerably altered in later epochs, and probably remained in use until the fifteenth century. The nave is divided into three aisles, and measures approximately 20 by 14.50 metres.

In the island of *Spetsai* Sotiriou has discovered the sites of two early Christian churches. One, close to the harbour, is partly occupied by the modern chapel of the Evangelistria. From the remains of the stylobates, column bases and other architectural fragments, the excavator deduces that the church, which had three aisles and measures 17 by 12 metres, dates from the second half of the fifth or the first half of the sixth century. The other, somewhat larger church is in the southern part of the island. Most of its materials have gone to the construction of two windmills, now ruined, close by. From what remains Sotiriou conjectures that the church was erected in or about the reign of Justinian.

IONIAN ISLANDS

Miss Benton, assisted by other members of the British School, continued her excavations in *Ithaca* during the summer. At Aetos she discovered the foundations of a large building, probably of an agora built in the fifth century, which overlay the foundations of a temple, destroyed perhaps in the seventh century, for a large late Protocorinthian oenochoe lay crushed on a stone fallen from the temple wall. The oenochoe (Pl. XIX) has two animal friezes: on the base is a horse's protome in outline. Beneath other fallen stones were fragments of amber and bronzes. The most interesting of the latter is a miniature lebes with griffin's head on a stand.

The temple had interrupted an apsidal building and lay partly on an early Geometric layer, which included a primitive bronze figurine, partly on a proto-Geometric deposit. Some of the vases in these deposits seem to be transitional between the two periods. To the south, lower down the hill, lay first a hearth connected with proto-Geometric pottery and then another foundation differently orientated, below a layer of terracottas. Beside these was an archaic terracotta altar painted with Dionysiac donkeys: below and around were groups of vases ranging from bowls of a proto-Geometric character to a fifth-century lekythos. Grouped with the vases were iron spear-heads, bronze horses on stands (Pl. XIX), a bronze goat on a spout (Fig. 6), bronze vases and fibulae, ivory seals and fibulae. These miscellaneous groups of vases in black earth had in parts impinged on a deposit of linear Geometric vases in grey clay, which lie to the south of the last-mentioned foundation. Corinthian vases were plentiful both on this spot and in a deposit at some distance, where there are house remains and an ancient terrace wall.

At *Tris Langadas* near Stavros Miss Benton completed the excavation of the Mycenaean site, recovering much pottery, but no house-plan. In the neighbourhood is a rectangular foundation containing Mycenaean pottery of the same style as the larger site: also three apsidal buildings overlapping one another, the earliest being very well built.

In the plain of *Kampos* at *Polis* the remains of a kiln of Roman date, containing a number of large amphorae, were cleared.

At *Nicopolis* Orlandos and Sotiriou have resumed the excavations which have been in abeyance since 1931. The principal work consisted in clearing the site of the large basilica, measuring 44.50 by 29.50 metres, part of which had come to light in 1931.




FIG. 6.—ARCHAIC BRONZE GOAT ON SPOUT FROM ITHACA.

CENTRAL GREECE

At *Delphi* the re-arrangement of the Museum proceeds slowly. The French School was occupied in 1937 mainly with the completion of the repairs on the site necessitated by the floods of 1936. Bousquet's study of the architectural details of the so-called Treasury of Cyrene lead him to date the building to the second quarter of the fourth century at the earliest, instead of the close of the fifth century, as was previously conjectured.

Krisa. Jannoray, Roger and van Effenterre of the French School continued their excavations in the locality called Magoula, adjoining the modern village of Kirrha. For a summary of their operations on the classical

site, and the prehistoric site underlying it, I would refer readers to Lemerle's summary in *BCH* lxi, 1937, pp. 457-61.

At *Nea Anchialos* Sotiriou was engaged upon the excavation of a large building in front of the agora. This building, to judge from the architectural sculpture found in it, was in use in both Roman and Byzantine times. He has also begun to excavate a number of early Christian houses at a point about 50 yards north of the first Basilica.

The excavations of the John Hopkins University at *Olynthus*,⁴ conducted under the auspices of the American School by David M. Robinson with the help of Professor George E. Mylonas, of Washington University, St. Louis, were continued for the fourth campaign with a staff of fifteen and an average of about 100 workmen from 28th March to 18th June. Some thirty more houses were excavated and a number of new streets located. The city plan is now established over an area about twice that shown in *Olynthus* viii, pl. 109. In general, the unit in the new section, as previously, was a block of ten houses, but there are also numerous individual houses of large dimensions, with open spaces on two or more sides.

One of the most important of these, and architecturally the best so far excavated, stands at the corner of Avenue G and Street I (Fig. 7). It has about ten rooms. The andron has the usual raised border. There is a room with cement floor, painted yellow, and walls of white base and red plaster above. Next west was a workroom with a side room and piles of pebbles for making mosaics, a heap of white clay, a stamnos of cement, grinders and vases containing red and blue pigments. South of these rooms was the long pastas, a cobblestone court and prothyron, and a store-room. There is a summer-room with mosaic floor and cistern and column-bases, on which pieces of mosaic had fallen from the second storey. Other rooms are the kitchen, bathroom, and living-room or *oikos* with a square hearth in the middle. The walls of the andron had a base of yellow, divided by vertical bands, and above that a surbase or raised dado-band of blue with moulded edges (0.15 metre wide) and a palmetted floral motive. Above this projection the walls were red. A similar raised band of blue with bright yellow on one side and a rich burnt orange on the other was found in another room. The statement in *Olynthus* viii, p. 299, that 'of this relief style there is absolutely no trace at Olynthus,' now requires modification. It is clear also from this house that the transition from the incised to the relief styles began at Olynthus about the middle of the fourth century, if not earlier. Two painted marble altars were found in the house, which also contained many fragments of coloured stucco (white, blue, red, orange, etc.). From the evidence of inscribed slingstones Robinson proposes to date the house before 348 B.C.

A fine house with eleven rooms produced, among other objects, the bronze rim of a shield decorated with dots and guilloche (Fig. 8), together with remains of the wooden shield to which it belonged, and of the attachments.

The finds in other houses consisted of terra-cotta masks, figurines of the

⁴ See *Illustrated London News*, Nov. 5th, 1938, pp. 846 ff.




FIG. 7.—HOUSE AT OLYNTHUS.



FIG. 8.—BRONZE SHIELD-RIM FROM OLYNTHUS.

best Greek style, moulds of a flute-playing Silenus and others, seated figures including a kouritrophos, comic Sileni and actors, some 178 in all. There are 598 vases, including kernoi with rings, such as occur at Eleusis, a skyphos with a seated Triptolemus and other Eleusinian deities with torches, cistae and sceptres, and six large kraters of the fourth century with Dionysiac and banquet scenes. There were many plain vases of different shapes, and many stamped plates. One oenochoe is painted at the back, and has on the front, in relief, two winged female figures pursuing a youth, who takes refuge with a woman, while another woman stands on the right. The figures may be Orestes, Electra and Chrysothemis. There are also numerous fourth-century plastic vases. Many inscriptions were found in or near the excavations. Among these are mentioned a treaty with Grabos, King of Illyria, in 356 B.C., and about half a dozen inscriptions recording the sale of houses for various sums. 635 coins were found, mostly in the houses. About twenty were silver tetrobols, and the remainder bronze, mostly Chalcidic (313) or Bottiaean.

MACEDONIA

Keramopoullos has undertaken small excavations at various parts of Macedonia, and has found tombs of widely differing dates, some of them previously disturbed, but nothing of outstanding interest.

At *Kavalla* Balalakis has discovered two burnt deposits containing bones, ashes, a great quantity of sherds and some fragments of statuettes. The pottery belongs to the archaic period, and includes East Greek, Attic, Corinthian, Laconian, Rhodian, Melian and Naucratic. There is not a single r.f. sherd. One of the sherds bears the name of the goddess Partheno inscribed upon it. The cult of the goddess must therefore have extended at least as far back as the sixth century. Balalakis places the closing of these deposits before the last quarter of that century, and feels confirmed in his previous conjecture that the Ionic peristyle temple of the goddess close by was erected about the beginning of the fifth.

Excavations at *Kalamitsa* produced, besides a wall of uncertain date, a number of sherds ranging from the sixth century B.C. to the end of the Roman period, some stamped amphora handles and some coins.

Amphipolis. The 'Lion of Amphipolis,' which was re-assembled in 1936 by a joint effort of the French and American Schools, on the initiative of Mr. Lincoln MacVeagh, United States Minister at Athens, has now been set up by the Greek authorities. As the restoration of the ancient base was impracticable, a concrete base, similar to that of the Lion of Chaeronea, has been provided.

Philippi. The French School have continued their operations, under the direction of Coupry, Lemerle and Roger, in collaboration with M. Du Coux, the architect. Their studies, which were entirely architectural and topographical, are described by Lemerle in *BCH* lxi, 1937, pp. 463-8.

In the spring of 1938 Rhomaïos excavated a large Hellenistic tomb at *Palatitsa*. The tomb is of the Ionic order, and has a decorative façade consisting of four pilasters, capitals, architrave and pediment. It is built of stone, covered with stucco, but the doors, with their posts and lintels, are of marble.

Rhomaïos dates it to the third century. Its area is 8.63 by 6.47 metres—nearly twice as large as the similar tomb excavated in the same locality by Daumet and Heuzey in 1861 (*Mission Archéologique de Macédoine*, pp. 227 ff.). The latter has since disappeared, its masonry having been freely used in the construction of a church about fifty years ago.

AEGEAN ISLANDS

Buschor, assisted by Wedeking and Jantzen, continued his excavations at the Heraion in *Samos* in the summer of 1937, working, as in the previous



FIG. 9.—BRONZE STATUETTE FROM SAMOS.

year, in the two areas south of the great altar and north of the Sacred Way respectively (see *AA* 1937, 203 ff.). In the former area he reached prehistoric houses and a portion of the prehistoric city wall which ran north-west under the great temple. An extensive early archaic building was found above the Mycenaean and Geometric strata: Buschor conjectures that this was the workshop established for the construction of the great altar. The finds in this area include much pottery, local and imported, and, in the neighbourhood of the altar, a number of terra-cotta votives. But the most noteworthy object is a bronze statuette, obviously not Greek, of a woman riding side-saddle on a horse, and holding a child in her arms (Fig. 9).

The construction of the museums at Vathy and Tigani is progressing.

The Italian School under Della Seta excavated at Hephaistia in *Lemnos* from August to November 1937. No further work was done for the time being at the prehistoric site of Poliochni.

At Hephaistia further excavations were carried out in the theatre, and disclosed two distinct periods in its history. The original Greek theatre dates from the fifth or early fourth century; its stage has disappeared. It was succeeded by a Roman theatre, the stage of which was erected upon the orchestra of the older building.

The excavation of the sanctuary of the Kabeiroi, on the north slope of the promontory by the harbour of Hephaistia, was begun, and is being continued this year. Portions of a large pavement, a stoa 32.70 metres long and 6.10 metres wide, with the lowest drums of all the columns still in position, and one angle of a large building, probably the Hellenistic temple, were uncovered in 1937. From the buildings so far uncovered, and particularly from the retaining walls, Della Seta recognises two distinct periods, a 'Tyrrhenian' and a Hellenistic.

On the same slope a basilica with three aisles was excavated. It seems to date from late Roman times, and occupies the site of an earlier 'Tyrrhenian' building. A pile of marble sculptural and inscriptional fragments, some of them of considerable interest, was found in a corner of this building. The fragments may possibly have been collected there for lime.

Miss Eccles, assisted by Miss Jeffrey, conducted a small test excavation in the lower cave at Agio Gala in *Chios*. She found Neolithic and early Bronze-Age pottery, a terracotta head and numerous implements of flint, bone and obsidian. It is hoped later on to examine the upper cave from which this material appears to have fallen.

Excavations were undertaken in *Naxos*, on behalf of the Archaeological Society, by Karouzos and Kondoleon, as a result of chance finds brought to light in 1937 by the construction of the local High School and its approach road, in particular the fragments of a fine orientalising amphora with a representation of a chariot drawn by winged horses and bearing Aphrodite with another deity. Numerous Geometric, orientalising and later sherds were discovered, together with more fragments of the amphora. Five Geometric rock tombs were also excavated in the neighbourhood. Two of these yielded important vases, the decoration of which was unfortunately much damaged by damp. One of them contained no fewer than thirty terracotta birds.

A second excavation took place on a hill to the north of the town, where chance finds had indicated the existence of a temple site. These included the legs of an archaic *kore* in Naxian marble, a female terracotta statuette of the early sixth century, some bronze fibulae and many Geometric and archaic sherds. The excavation produced quantities of Geometric and orientalising fragments, and some more small bronze finds, but the site of the temple has yet to be located.

Young and Brock carried out a short final excavation at Kastro in *Siphnos* in May and June. They cleared the remainder of the area on the Acropolis in which the seventh-century deposit was found last year, but obtained very little more from it. Below it, however, they came upon a

well-preserved Geometric house, built into a crevice of the rock, and similar to the houses found in previous years on other parts of the hill-side. A portion of this house had been exposed in 1937, and it was hoped at the time that it would prove to be the temple contemporary with the deposit. It is now, however, clear that the temple must have stood on higher ground to the south, where the rock is practically at the surface. The steep north-east slope below this area was also thoroughly excavated, but produced very little.

Further sections of the marble acropolis wall were cleared, and its whole course traced. It runs in places through modern houses and churches.



FIG. 10.—GEMS FROM SIPHNOS.

The area within this wall forms a rough parallelogram about 99 by 33 metres.

A fine Geometric steatite seal was acquired locally and presented to the National Museum at Athens. It is very similar in style to the three-sided seal found in 1935 and to the alabaster signet-ring found last year. All three gems (Fig. 10) appear to be of Siphnian origin.

CRETE

Knossos. During the latter half of January a small Roman mosaic floor, some 5 metres square, came to light south-east of the Basilica. The central medallions of the mosaic had been damaged beyond reconstruction, but the triple cable encircling them and the conventional border were well preserved. The scanty pottery associated with the mosaic was more Hellenistic than Roman, but the mosaic itself probably belongs to the early Empire. Some elements, such as the triple cable and the pelta, look late, though less unequivocally late than the quadruple cable and the

running pelta. An early feature, however, is the line of small so-called 'Celtic knot.' The design as a whole resembles closely a floor at St. Albans dated about A.D. 160, and it seems not unreasonable to assign our mosaic and the house to which it belongs to the second century A.D.

A well lying immediately west of the façade of the 'Unexplored Mansion' behind the Little Palace was also cleared. The upper metres of the well were choked with an abundance of Hellenistic pottery, chiefly small cups. As the water level was approached the Hellenistic pottery decreased and a quantity of tiles mixed with some archaic pithos sherds appeared. The date when the well was first sunk is still obscure. All that can be said is that it must lie between 1400 and 600 B.C.

Surface finds were numerous, but with one exception not important. There was the usual crop of small Roman coins and Minoan beads. The most interesting find, from the east slopes of Monasteriako Kephali, was a fragment of a conical rhyton in steatite, similar to those from Hagia Triada, with a design in low relief showing a building with a portico on a steep slope surrounded apparently by cypresses. One stone of the terrace wall supporting the porch appears to bear a mason's mark. It is tempting to suggest that we have in this fragment a contemporary illustration of one corner of the 'Palace of Minos'.

Lasithi. Pendlebury, assisted by Mrs. Pendlebury, Miss Money-Coutts and other members of the British School, continued his excavations in the neighbourhood of the Lasithi plain, with the aid of grants from the Craven funds of Oxford and Cambridge as well as from the School.

The interior of the Archaic house, at Kolonna on the edge of the plain, the façade of which had been cleared in 1937, was first excavated. Much of the pottery found in this house appeared to be archaic or classical, but it included later pieces, notably a lamp inscribed ΝΙΚΙΑC ΑΥΚΙΟC in characters which appear to be of the late third century. There was no stratification.

Two interesting objects appeared in one of the rooms. The first was a terracotta figurine of a lion, resembling the later series of lion figures from Palaikastro, and probably dateable to the early fifth century. The second was a terracotta figurine of a dolphin, made both to stand and to hang, carrying on its back a man bearing a child in his arms (Fig. 11). The human figures are headless, but the object gives the impression of Hellenistic workmanship. It may represent the rescue of the young Dionysos by a sea-god.

Numerous loom-weights were discovered in all parts of the building, which was possibly a weaving establishment, since it contains also troughs and vats, which may well have been used for dyeing.

The main part of the season was devoted to the large city site of Karphi on the top of a hill some 1200 feet above the plain and 4000 feet above sea-level. The site dates from the Sub-Minoan proto-Geometric period. A shrine had been excavated here during the previous season and a number of figures of goddesses found. Two tholos tombs had also been excavated at a spot called Ta Mnemata slightly below the summit.

Of this group of tholoi six more were cleared. Many minor variations

were noticed, but all conformed to the same general type, a free-standing built tomb surrounded by a rectangular mass of masonry. The dromoi run towards every point of the compass, and in several cases parallel to and not in the slope of the hill. In some cases the doorway was too small for the insertion of the body or of the stones which were to block it, and it is clear that it is a mere survival, the interment taking place through the roof. Some good pottery was found, as well as a number of simple bow fibulae and the remains of a collar of bronze discs sewn on to some material.

A similar and contemporary group of tholoi was excavated by Miss Pascoe on the east side of the ridge of Koprana at Astividhero. The most interesting find was a pithos which seemed to have contained the body.

Besides the continuation of the work on the necropoleis of the site, progress was made on the city itself.

Up the precipitous northern slope of the saddle a single path leads from Krasi. Near the top it has been artificially improved, and a gap in the rocks, where it emerges on to the saddle, has been artificially widened, as was noticed by Sir Arthur Evans in 1896. At this point a group of five buildings, backing up against the rock, was cleared. The first, much ruined, seems to have been a watch-tower. The remainder consist of a single large room entered from the west end, and sometimes containing a stone ledge along one wall. The back wall of one was pierced by a window which gave on to a small store-room formed by the native rock. An open court was included in the line of buildings, and from this a rough road led up to the higher saddle between Mikre and Megale Koprana. From their position and simplicity of plan, it would appear that these structures were in the nature of guard-houses.

In the hollow to the south of the temple lies the largest house of this period yet excavated, being over 20 metres long by 10 across. It is entered from the east through a small entrance hall which leads into the main room. The roof of this was supported on two columns on the main axis. In one corner was a small partition, about a metre high, acting as a stand for water-jars. By it a hatch led into a narrow store-room. The carbonised beams which supported the ceiling, as well as much of the ceiling plaster and the waterproof earth used for the flat roof, were recovered in sufficient quantities to make possible a reconstruction of the system used.

These rooms formed the original house. At a slightly later date the west wall was cut through and a further room added to the house proper. Behind this, over what must originally have been the refuse-tip of the house, two store-rooms were added, which must have been entered by a trap-door and a ladder, since they have no external communication. Along the north side of the house runs a paved path which steps up to a big open courtyard, which also seems partly to overlies the rubbish tip.

In spite of the most careful examination, no distinction can yet be drawn between the pottery of the rubbish-tip and that belonging to the buildings above it. The finds, other than clay vases, comprised two small pottery figurines, two sickles of bronze, a bronze chisel and several bronze knives.

A street ran along the south side of the house, and on the other side



FIG. 11.—POTTERY FIGURINE FROM KOLONNA.



FIG. 12.—KAPHI. PAINTED CLAY ALTAR AND VASES.

of it a number of other buildings were cleared. These, like the houses of Gournia, are terraced up, one above the other. The street itself is paved like the modern 'kalderim,' and has at one corner the same oblique line of stones to break the force of such rain-water as might flow down it.

The most interesting finds came from above an outcrop of rock projecting into one of the rooms. Here was found the top of a vase in the shape of a well-modelled human head (Fig. 12), a similar head painted to show a beard, and a ring vase from which project three bull's heads. With this pottery was found a very fine votive double axe of bronze of a somewhat unusual shape.

In another room was found a portable altar of clay in the shape of a tall, rectangular building surmounted by a circular rim. The 'Horns of Consecration' are shown both in paint and in open work, whilst on the four corners are figures of recumbent animals, perhaps stags (Fig. 12).

Another ritual object was discovered in a small building on the top of Mikre Koprana. This was a kalathos of coarse clay, from the bottom of which projects the upper half of a rude figure of the goddess with raised arms, bearing a cup on her head.

With regard to the pottery, Pendlebury observes as follows:—'The action of the soil on the painted pottery has had very bad effects, as at Mallia. With laborious cleaning, however, a great number of decorated vases will be capable of restoration. The typical shapes are reminiscent of Vrokastro, the cylindrical pyxis, the small two-handled bowl and the kalathos. Spouted tankards such as that from the Diktaian Cave also occur. The pithoi and jugs, however, are purely Minoan in character. Only one possible example of strictly proto-Geometric decoration occurred. In the main the decoration approximates to the close, "fringed" style found at Moulia and elsewhere in East Crete, though rarely in Central Crete, once at Isopata and once at Milatos. This style Mackenzie long ago suggested might be Achaian. It is found at Mycenae and in Rhodes.

'Since this pottery (Fig. 12) is clearly of a period transitional between the Minoan and the Iron Ages, it has been suggested that the period should be called "Intermediate" and the terms sub-Minoan and proto-Geometric reserved for styles.

'In conclusion, Karphi was evidently the most important centre and city of refuge for the old Minoan stock on the arrival of the iron-using Dorian invaders from Greece. The inhabitants continued to develop along the old lines, but the occurrence of fibulae and fragments of iron, as well as of proto-Geometric shapes, shows that they were not impervious to new influences. The absence of any signs of destruction, as well as the fact that few objects other than pottery were recovered, seems to show that when times became more peaceful, the inhabitants quietly deserted this wild peak and descended to the Papoura, where in 1936 a tomb of the succeeding Geometric Period was excavated. But such interpretations can only be confirmed by further exploration.'

CYPRUS⁵

The third season at *Khirokitia*, where Dikaïos is excavating a Neolithic Settlement on behalf of the Antiquities Department, has disclosed another large area above that excavated in 1936 and 1937 (Fig. 13). The long wall running through the settlement was found to continue through this new area towards the shoulder which separates the spur on which the settlement is built from the surrounding country. Near the highest point, where the



FIG. 13.—KHIROKITIA. UPPER PART OF NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT.

wall is interrupted by a massive circular tower, it terminates in a series of alternating buttresses and recesses on the western face. As before, hut foundations were found on both sides of this central feature, but here they were larger. In the centre of one of the largest, high up and to the east of the wall, a rectangular platform was found, in two corners of which were burials furnished with broken stone vases. A number of other burials were found both inside and outside the huts, bringing the total of the settlement

⁵ Communicated by Mr. A. H. S. Megaw, Director of Antiquities.

to forty-eight, many of them with complete stone vases. These are important as the first examples of grave furniture in Neolithic burials in Cyprus. The bowls themselves include some fine specimens with open spouts, evidently the prototypes of the spouted pottery bowls from Erimi, others are decorated with relief decoration. Other finds include a stone staff-head in the shape of a lion's or panther's head, carnelian necklaces, tools of flint, stone, bone and obsidian and stone ornaments. Pottery was found in a stratified deposit for the first time in the uppermost levels. It belongs to the *Red on White* and *Reserved Slip* ware, such as was found in the lowest levels at Erimi, and thus provides a valuable link with the culture represented by that site.

In the Early Bronze-Age cemetery at *Vounous* near Bellapais, Stewart continued his excavations under the auspices of the British School at Athens for a short season in the autumn. The results amplified those of the spring campaign (*JHS* lvii, 1937, 143), and it now seems that the earliest part of this cemetery antedates the tombs excavated by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition at Lapithos. Its pottery therefore elucidates an early and obscure phase in the development of Cypriote pottery. The most important find was an imported jar, tentatively identified as Palestinian of about 2700 to 2600 B.C., the chronological value of which may be very great.

At *Curium* the Pennsylvania University Expedition resumed its excavations during a short season in the spring. At the sanctuary of Apollo, a little to the south-west of the main temple, the remains of what appears to be a small propyleum building were uncovered, and steps have been taken to conserve, and in part reconstruct, the broad flight of steps which it flanks and which ascend to the temple. A short preliminary account of the work carried out up to the beginning of the 1938 season both at the Apollo sanctuary and on the hill of Curium has appeared in the *Pennsylvania University Museum Bulletin* (Vol. 7, No. 2), and Daniel has published a fuller account of his excavations in 1937 in the late Bronze-Age Settlement at the Bamboula to the East of Episcopi village in *AJA* xlii, pp. 261 ff. From an important series of inscriptions in the 'Cypro-Minoan' script on vase rims and handles, he deduces that the Achaean colonisation of the city took place before the fall of Mycenae, and that the name of the classical city was already current in the Bronze Age. In the spring of 1938 Daniel continued his investigations in a northerly direction where he was rewarded by the discovery of the most substantial architectural remains the site has yet yielded.

At *Ayios Philon*, Miss du Plat Taylor, excavating for the Antiquities Department, completed the investigation of the basilican predecessor of the Byzantine church, which was itself consolidated in the course of the winter. The buildings surrounding it were further examined and, with the aid of a grant from the Ashmolean Museum, a number of tombs of Hellenistic date were excavated at the neighbouring sites of Tsambres and Aphentrika.

A valuable grant from the Leverhulme Trust for the investigation of mediaeval monuments has enabled the Antiquities Department to embark on a comprehensive programme of excavation and survey work. At the

hill-top castle of St. Hilarion Mr. J. S. Last is preparing a detailed survey of the whole enclosure, and excavations are bringing to light many features long since buried in debris which it is hoped will elucidate the history of the castle under the Byzantine and Lusignan rulers of Cyprus. At the Gothic Abbey of Bellapais and the Venetian Fortifications of Famagusta similar investigations are bearing fruitful results.

GERARD M. YOUNG

*The British School,
Athens.*

MANNERS AND METHODS IN ARCHAEOLOGY

[PLATES XX, XXI.]

PROFESSOR G. E. RIZZO, in his *Saggi Preliminari su L'Arte della Moneta nella Sicilia Greca*—a book beautifully produced, and ennobled by Baron Pennisi's wonderful photographs—has done me the honour of quoting several passages from a lecture delivered before the British Academy in 1934, and published in volume XX of its *Proceedings* under the title *Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy*.

Since his quotations embody some variants from what I wrote, he will perhaps allow me to correct the more ingenious, leaving aside those where only his English is at fault and any reader interested in accurate scholarship can compare my original text with his rendering of it. But after disposing of this personal matter, and ignoring the frequent abuse which serves to add bulk and save reasoning, I shall quickly pass to a consideration of certain features of his archaeological method; not doubting the prolonged, profound and silent studies here proclaimed, but attempting to judge them rather by their results than by their advertisement.

In my lecture I stated that I did not approach Syracusan coinage as a numismatist, meaning that I could not, in the enforced brevity of an hour's paper, enter into purely numismatic problems, could not, for example, discuss the question of the relation between the original design and the finished die of a coin, as a numismatist should in any intensive study.¹ This phrase, the meaning of which is perfectly clear from the whole lecture, if not from the immediate context, is interpreted as a confession that I have not been in the habit of studying the coins at all.²

¹ This problem has been finally solved, *ex cathedra*, by Rizzo: There must always have been a plastic model (p. 70): no evidence given. Maker of hypothetical model and engraver of die assumed (when convenient) to be the same person: no evidence given. The lowest point of probability and the highest of dogma is reached when we are solemnly told (p. 33) that in order to produce a slight modification of what (in spite of special pleading) will always remain, however prettily finished, a second-rate die, the artist certainly re-worked ('ha certamente rielaborato') the plastic model in a number of minute details. Did engravers of *gems* always make preliminary models? This is surely relevant. The reply is affirmative or negative according to one's fancy; no evidence needed. Modern practice is decisive only against the dogmatic assumption that there must always have been a model, for modern gem-engravers sometimes work from a highly finished model (usually translated into *intaglio*), sometimes

from a rough sketch, and sometimes cut the stone direct.

² 'Ma io contesto che un archeologo possa avvalersi di continui confronti coi tipi monetali (*op. cit.* p. 47). . . . Il quale avrebbe fatto meglio a studiare direttamente le monete' (*id.* p. 34); and so on. In the event, it is clear (*id.* p. 6, and p. 46, note 4) that Rizzo has done very much what I have—studied the coins where he had ready access to them, casts or publications where he had not, the difference being that I did not claim the title of numismatist, whereas he describes himself as 'not primarily a numismatist.' Whatever the definition of a numismatist, scrupulous regard for evidence is the first essential in this, as in any other form of archaeology. If Rizzo had visited the British Museum, he would perhaps have realised that it contains one of the two finest collections of coins, and casts of coins, in the world: it has been open to my constant demands for twenty years with a generosity unknown elsewhere.

I said that the style of Syracusan coinage might possibly have originated in Corinth. Rizzo translates 'style' by 'types.'³ The failure to distinguish between the repetition of a *type*, and the *style* in which it is repeated, recurs several times in the book (see, for instance, the remarkable illustration in his fig. 43 and what is deduced from it), and may well be the predisposing cause of this confusion.

Of the tetradrachm of Naxos (Plate XXI, 10, 12), I wrote: 'It is tempting to see in this coin of a Chalcidian city . . . a Chalcidian work. But there is no evidence to prove it.' Rizzo: 'We learn from Ashmole that it is a Chalcidian work'; and he then proceeds to give a translation correct until the essential words 'there is no evidence to prove it,' which he renders 'non vi sono prove evidenti (sic!) per dimostrare la verità della sua asserzione.'⁴ The *sic* is unfortunate, for 'prove evidenti' is far from being a correct translation of 'evidence,' and 'assertion' is a false term for my tentative suggestion.

These things are, perhaps, mainly a question of manners, on which there is difference of opinion from place to place, and even from person to person. But more is involved when the same methods are applied to archaeology; for the principles of honesty in archaeological investigation are pretty much the same everywhere. Let us see how they fare.

With a kindly word to numismatists in general, 'who are not much versed in such studies,' Rizzo proceeds to establish the artistic connections of a certain marble head. For the purpose of comparison he shows it in profile only, and is silent, not only on its whereabouts (Copenhagen), but also on the modern restorations, namely, the nose, both the lips, and the chin. He may prefer it so (the abundant plaster in his book on Praxiteles makes this probable),⁵ but his deductions have not quite the validity they might have if he were comparing ancient with ancient instead of ancient with modern.⁶ And was it quite fair to his flock, at their first lesson in such studies?

What are his methods when dealing with Greek material? They may fairly be said to constitute a new technique in the handling of evidence. Hardly a question they cannot settle once for all: and the satisfying certainty of his own results forms an agreeable contrast to the 'absurdity' and 'puerility' of those other writers—if living—who come near (more absurd and more puerile the nearer they come) to his private field of research. To illustrate these methods, I confine myself to one only of the main

³ 'The general style is a somewhat dry archaic, its origin possibly Corinth' (*Proc. Brit. Acad.* XX, p. 109 (19)). 'Lo Ashmole ha, infatti, supposto che gl'incisori siracusani copiassero i tipi delle monete arcaiche di Corinto' (Rizzo, *op. cit.* p. 24).

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 76. 'Apprendiamo . . . che esso è opera di arte calcidese . . . lo stesso autore si affretta a soggiungere, che non vi sono prove evidenti (sic!) per dimostrare la verità della sua asserzione.' This manipulative skill is not confined to English and Italian: it has been applied with equal success to Greek: Rizzo, *RM* XL (1925), p. 235; on which

see Trendall, *Paestan Pottery*, p. 105.

⁵ The belief current until some fifty years ago that there can be 'accurate' and 'inaccurate' restorations of Greek sculpture is revived by Rizzo in *Transactions of the Numismatic Congress* (1936), p. 132, and of course in his *Prassitele*, *passim*.

⁶ It would have been a kindness, both to the Author and to his readers, if some reviewer had pointed this out when *Prassitele* first appeared, for such comparisons are apparently to be a feature, and certainly (as is claimed in the advertisement) the most original feature, of yet another work.

problems discussed, and will state it as briefly as possible. In, or just after, 480 B.C., the famous Damareteion decadrachms were issued in Syracuse (Plate XX, 2), valuable not only for their artistic excellence, but for the fact that they are among the few Greek coins that can be securely dated. Four years later, 476 B.C., the city of Naxos was destroyed by the Syracusans: it was restored in 461 B.C. Also in 476 the city of Catana was resettled by Syracusans and renamed Aetna: it, too, was restored, and resumed its original name, in 461. These facts are generally admitted.

There exist coinages belonging to these three cities, Naxos, Catana and Aetna.

Of Naxos there is an undoubtedly archaic coinage, followed by an issue of which the most famous coin is a tetradrachm bearing a head of Dionysus on the one side and a squatting silen on the other (Plate XXI, 10, 12); from the historical facts mentioned above, the dies for it must have been engraved either before 476 or after 461.

Catana is more complicated. Here we have a series of tetradrachms bearing on one side a human-headed bull, on the other a figure of Victory (*e.g.* Plate XX, 4, 5). Opinions differ on their date, but, again from historical circumstances, they must be either before 476 or after 461: it has been suggested that some are before and some after. Almost certainly after 461 is another series of tetradrachms, also belonging to Catana, with different types—namely, head of Apollo on one side, victorious chariot on the other. There are also smaller coins (*litrae*) of Catana having the head of a silen on one side (Plate XX, 6), thunderbolt on the other: date uncertain again, but either before 476 or after 461.

Of the city of Aetna, which replaced Catana between those two dates, we have one specimen of a tetradrachm with head of a silen on one side and Zeus seated on the other (Plate XX, 1, 3; and, much enlarged, Plate XXI, 9): the smaller coins do not here concern us.

Evidently the relation of the finer dies from among these coinages to each other and to those at Syracuse is of great interest. It has been suggested in the past that one pair of the Damareteion dies (Plate XX, 2, the reverse of this pair) is by the same engraver as the unique tetradrachm of Aetna. It has been suggested that one pair of the Bull/Victory dies of Catana (Plate XX, 4, 5) is by the same engraver as the unique tetradrachm of Aetna. It has been suggested that this same pair of Catanaean dies is by the same engraver as the Dionysus/Squatting silen of Naxos. It has been suggested by others—and the suggestion is here adopted and elaborated by Rizzo—that the dies for this tetradrachm of Catana (Plate XX, 4, 5), those for the Dionysus Squatting silen tetradrachm of Naxos (Plate XXI, 10, 12), and those for the tetradrachm of Aetna (Plate XX, 1, 3; XXI, 9) are all by the same engraver. He dates them as follows:—

1. NAXOS. (Tetradrachm) Head of Dionysus/Squatting silen (Plate XXI, 10, 12) 'A few years' before 476 B.C.⁷

⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 60: 'codesto tetradrammo del Tauro fu coniato immediatamente prima dell'anno 476. Lo stesso Maestro aveva, pochi anni innanzi, model-

lato ed incisio un altro tetradrammo . . . per . . . Naxos.'

2. CATANA. (Tetradrachm) Man-headed bull/Victory.
One coin (Plate XX, 4, 5) immediately before 476 B.C.⁷; the remainder 'early 5th century, perhaps not before 490, certainly not after 480 B.C.'⁸
(Litra) Head of silen (Plate XX, 6)/Thunderbolt: before 476 B.C.⁹
3. AETNA. (Tetradrachm) Head of silen/Seated Zeus (Plate XX, 1, 3; XXI, 9). Perhaps 472 B.C.¹⁰

These conclusions (like every statement) may be right or may be wrong: but they are more likely to be right if they take account of the evidence. An obvious criterion is the stage of development which has been reached in the drawing of the eye. We have the dated Damareteion (Plate XX, 2), which shows that at 480 B.C. the eye was still generally drawn frontal in a profile head, but that the lids tended to assume a double instead of a single curve, as the draughtsman gradually became aware of the effects of a foreshortened view. There is no evidence for anything more advanced than that: the Damareteion issue is pretty certainly the most forward of its time in Sicily.¹¹ It would therefore be awkward for Rizzo's theory that all the Bull/Victory coins of Catana (except the one claimed for 476) are before 480, if any of them had the eye drawn in profile. Yet this is certain in at least one, probable in others.¹² How does Rizzo meet this difficulty? He does not mention it.

He has a different approach to the same problem when it arises again in the litrae of Catana—namely to state, simply, that the eye is still

⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 57: 'appartengono al principio del secolo quinto, forse non prima dell'anno 490, certo non dopo il 480.'

⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 59: 'lo stile escluderebbe, da solo, la supposta data posteriore all'anno 461.'

⁹ *Op. cit.* p. 76, note 26.

¹¹ That the change in drawing from frontal to profile eye was starting to take place just after 480 at Syracuse is shown by the following evidence: (a) one die of a tetradrachm in the 'Damareteion' series (Boehringer, *Die Münzen von Syrakus*, Pl. 15, R275, probably late in the series since it is linked with dies of the same series in a very broken condition), already has the eye rendered in profile; so, apparently, have most of the obols of the 'Damareteion' issue: (b) the coin of Leontini based on the Damareteion has a profile eye (see *Proc. Brit. Acad.* XX, p. 111 (21), Pl. X, 39).

On the other hand the series illustrated in Rizzo's fig. 17, which seems to succeed the 'Damareteion' issues, retains the frontal eye.

¹² Certain in the coins illustrated *op. cit.* fig. 35, 4 & 6; 'probable' only in those illustrated *id.* fig. 35, 1, 2 & 3 (cf. fig. 39), because, apart from the small scale, some of the dies were corroded when the coins were struck. This is obvious when the coin, and not

a cast or an illustration, is examined. This corrosion (the reason for which, though it is interesting and may have some bearing on the chronological problem, cannot be discussed here) is apparently what Rizzo means when he speaks of imperfect technique ('tecnica imperfetta' p. 51), and explains (p. 55) the difficulty engravers had in rendering the human face, gradually achieving it in dies arbitrarily assumed to be successive. If I do not misunderstand him, and he really believes that the roughness of the first coin illustrated in his fig. 39 is due to the engraver's inability to carve (instead of to the corrosion and subsequent re-cutting of the die), comment is difficult: adequate comment impossible. Numismatic evidence (from the Ognina hoard) for the later date of at least some of this series can be produced by numismatists, and must have been temporarily forgotten by Rizzo, who clearly knows of the hoard: (see E. S. G. Robinson's forthcoming review in the *Numismatic Chronicle*.) Herzfelder's verbal suggestion, quoted by me (*Proc. Brit. Acad.* XX, p. 114 (24), note 2) that the Bull Nike coins are interspersed among those with Victorious chariot, Head of Apollo types, is ignored by Rizzo: it renders evitable his 'inevitable consequence' on p. 58.

fully frontal.¹³ I reproduce one of the litrae on a large scale (Plate XX, 6), so that readers will be able to form their own judgement.

And it should be noted that neither here nor elsewhere in this article am I attacking theories, however fanciful, but only alleged statements of fact. If the facts are not correctly stated, how is it possible to accept the inferences drawn from them?

In comparing the Aetnaean with the Naxian tetradrachm (Plate XX, 1, 3; XXI, 9, 10, 12), Rizzo, incredible though it may seem, speaks of the placing of the inscription on the obverse in one and on the reverse on the other as the sole difference between the two coins.¹⁴ I have mentioned elsewhere several other points of difference,¹⁵ and will here add more. The relief is higher in the Aetnaean coin:¹⁶ the truncation of the neck, though similar, is not identical;¹⁷ the manner of rendering the hair of Dionysus is a new thing; all the parallels to it seem to be well after 476 B.C. But more important is the drawing of the eye: the iris and pupil are deeply incised in one; the eyeball is modelled up, but neither iris nor pupil is incised at all, in the other.¹⁸ No mention of this. The eye of the silen on the Aetnaean coin is in profile: agreed, with the proviso that the iris is still three-quartered. That of Dionysus on the Naxian is, says Rizzo, not yet in profile. Plate XXI, 10 shows this eye on a large scale; it is in profile. If any shadow of doubt exists, it is at once dispelled by a look at the eye of the silen on the reverse (Plate XXI, 12), struck from a die engraved, everyone agrees, by the same hand on the same occasion.

Turn from the style to the lettering: put the three coins for which common authorship is claimed side by side. The Bull/Victory coin (Plate XX, 5) has the I and the N cut with single straight grooves in

¹³ *Op. cit.* p. 59: 'conserva ancora l'occhio disegnato di pieno prospetto.' In Rizzo's fig. 35 the litra A does (from a hasty glance at a picture of it) look as if it has a frontal eye: but it is clear, on proper examination, that the inner corner is wide open—i.e. the eye, though long, is in profile. About B (my Plate XX, 6) there is no doubt: it is simply a profile eye.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 66: 'questa unica differenza.'

¹⁵ *Proc. Brit. Acad.* XX, p. 113 (23), note 2. Rizzo cites the circle of dots, its interruption by the beard on both coins, and the double curve of the truncated neck among the resemblances which prove that the dies were by the same hand. But since the circle of dots is a very common border, and since its interruption by the beard was (like the double curve of the neck) also a feature of the litrae of Catana (Plate XX, 6), the dies of which were engraved (on his own hypothesis) before Aetna was founded, and by another artist, these arguments are nothing to the purpose.

¹⁶ I do not consider this an argument against common authorship, and should not have mentioned it had not Rizzo himself used it elsewhere (in the rhetorical passage on p. 29, as if it were: a good en-

graver can surely vary the height of his relief at will. It was an error of taste to restore the Aetnaean coin (*op. cit.* pp. 6 and 61), but I cannot convince Rizzo of this if he cannot see for himself that it destroys the balance of this exquisite design: deviations of millimetres have importance when the design depends for its effect on fractions of millimetres. If he could not resist tampering with it, the beard should have been restored on the analogy of the Aetnaean litra (his fig. 44, 5) rather than on that of the Naxian tetradrachm. Or has he not noticed that they differ? And the fake should, in honesty, have been labelled.

¹⁷ The similarity between the truncation of the neck of Dionysus on the Naxian coin and the truncations on certain coins of Syracuse, Catana and Leontini, though minimised by Rizzo (*op. cit.* p. 66), is in fact very close. Those of Catana and Leontini (e.g. *Proc. Brit. Acad.* XX pl. XIII, 57, 58) are certainly after 461, and, most numismatists would say, also those of Syracuse (e.g. Rizzo, *op. cit.* fig. 24, 6, 9).

¹⁸ An important distinction, as anyone who has studied the coinage of the second half of the fifth century must be aware.

the die; the A has an horizontal cross-bar. The Naxian coin (Plate XXI, 12) has similar forms for the letters, horizontal bar for the A, and the I and N cut as before. These two inscriptions are fairly consistent with each other. Now look at the Aetnaean coin (Plate XXI, 9). No horizontal bar to the A, the O cut differently, and—this is the important point—the extremities of the I and the N marked in the die with circular drillings, which appear as dots on the coin. Is it not rather odd that a man who could cut, without the drill, such magnificent letters as those of the Naxian coin, should suddenly adopt another method, thus producing a different and less happy result?¹⁹

No doubt all the differences of detail and lettering can be explained away; but it was careless to forget to mention them.

Rizzo finally uses an epigraphical argument. It is inconceivable, he says, that X should appear for Ξ in Sicily after 461 B.C.²⁰ The coin illustrated in my Plate XX, 7, 8 even Rizzo's views on style could hardly allow him to put before 476. If not before 476, it must be after 461; for it is from no further afield than Naxos itself. And, by an inconceivable lapse, X has been written for Ξ . The worst of the ancients is that they will not keep the rules.

In turning the pages of Rizzo's book, the reader may have caught sight of what looks like the tail-piece to a folio on Etruscan Urns (Plate XXI, 11). Closer study shows that it purports to be a translation of the coin of Sicilian Naxos into the technique of an Attic red-figured vase, an idea conceived by the Author, and carried out under his direction.²¹ And indeed the ingenuity with which it has been devised is beyond praise. How cleverly the head of a silen by Epictetus in the British Museum has been adapted, with its incised bounding-line, its purple ivy-wreath and a purple touch below the lips: then, because its own body was in profile we have a frontal torso borrowed from Euthymides: the dotted nipples, the hooked collar-bones, the line from the navel down, the contrast between 'relief-lines' and fainter lines, all are there. All so like the vases of 500 B.C.; and all quite remote from the coin. We pass quickly over the less important discrepancies, such as that the head is smaller in relation to its body and different in its proportions (look, for instance, at the distance between the eyebrow and the top of the skull in Plate XXI, 11, and Plate XXI, 12): that the left foot has been lopped off: that the amusing contrasts in the texture of the hair are gone—the wiry mane, the bristling beard, the uncombed tail:²² gone, too, the curious leanness, which has been eliminated by broadening

¹⁹ It might be maintained that this was a safer method of cutting the letters, and sometimes it was possibly adopted for that reason (cf. Casson in *Transactions of the Numismatic Congress* (1936), p. 48). But the Aetnaean die has every appearance of being carefully and unhurriedly executed, and the Naxian, engraved on Rizzo's hypothesis some years before, was perfectly successful by the other method; is in fact an exquisite piece of lettering.

²⁰ *Op. cit.* p. 72: 'La presenza della lettera X invece che della Ξ . . . è inconcepibile nell' alfabeto

siceliota dopo l'anno 461.'

²¹ *Op. cit.* p. 73: 'disegno da me ideato e diretto.'

²² *Op. cit.* p. 75: 'Essi hanno tutti la testa folta di capelli fin sulla fronte, come il Sileno di Naxos.' I cannot but admit the entire correctness of this observation so far as it concerns the silen of Epictetus. Is it conceivable that Rizzo has failed to observe that the hair of the Naxian silen is swept in wild fashion *backwards*, and does not come clustering on to the forehead at all?

the torso on our left so as to fill the space between the ribs and the knee: gone the three-quartered hand with splayed fingers. But the unique quality of the Naxian coin does not consist in, though it is enhanced by, such features as these. What distinguishes it from, for instance, the commonplace little die which Rizzo (*op. cit.* fig. 44, 5) wishes to attribute to the same engraver, lies in the mastery with which the torso is disposed in space, not only leaning over towards its left, with the line of the shoulders running strongly in the opposite direction, but also turned away out of the frontal, towards, but not as far as, a three-quarter position; with a consequent foreshortening of the forms of the torso as they sheer away from the eye: the whole of the relief rising gradually towards the right (our left) of the body, so that the highest points are his right breast, right knee and shin. If this twist—integral part of a remarkably advanced conception of the whole body as an object in three dimensions²³—is not at once apparent, notice how close the edge of the abdominal muscles comes to the bounding-contour of the body on our right, and how the upper central point of the pubic hair is inclined sideways and shown well to our right of the visible part of the belly. Now look at the translation. The eye is shown fully frontal instead of in profile, not even with the double curve of the Damareteion, but in the stage many years earlier, a simple almond shape. This is in accordance with the principle already established, of denying the inconvenient;²⁴ so that we need not do more than mark its recurrence. The abdominal muscles are set more upright: so is the iliac line. The torso is more nearly facing the front; the pubic hair is placed in the centre of the visible part of the belly and is set vertical. There is nothing of the movement of the right breast or shoulder towards the spectator nor of the subtle gradation of planes by which it is suggested. In short, everything that would tell against an early dating has been altered to tell in its favour. Lest I should seem to be imputing some lack of ingenuousness to a colleague, it is possible that, having failed to grasp the essential quality of the coin, he did not intend and cannot detect the perversion.

It is also to be hoped that I have not given a false impression by limiting my criticism mainly to one part of the book. The remaining two thirds, reprinted from *Bollettino d'Arte*, are rather better. And Pennisi's illustrations are unsurpassable.

BERNARD ASHMOLE.

London.

²³ There is, I think, no relief of the first half of the fifth century to compare with this for solidity; and the drawings and reliefs round about 500 B.C. which Rizzo cites, neatly disprove, by their lack of consistent foreshortening, the very point he is seeking to establish. The anatomical resemblances described

at such length (pp. 69 ff.) are of course not resemblances of style, but of the human body.

²⁴ There are naturally less forthright ways of dealing with inconvenient evidence: a good example in Rizzo, *RM.* XL (1925), p. 235 (already exposed by Trendall, *Paestan Pottery*, p. 102, note 2).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES IN SICILY AND MAGNA GRAECIA

SICILY.

At *Syracuse*, in the area between Neapolis and south Achradina, where Landolina found the famous Venus in 1804 and where Prof. Orsi later investigated some Greek tombs (*NSc* 1925, pp. 176–208; 296–321), the digging of trenches, 4 m. deep, for the foundations of a new hospital brought to light an archaic Greek cemetery. The tombs are for the most part excavated in the rock, and are covered with thick slabs in several pieces. In one of the trenches five large sarcophagi were discovered; they were each cut from a single block of stone, and their covers are in one piece. Two have been brought to the Museum, while three remain buried under the foundations. Their contents were unimportant. The pottery found, mostly fragmentary, is Corinthian, Rhodian and archaic Attic of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The most interesting of the vases, now undergoing restoration, and not yet exposed in the Museum, is an amphora showing a warrior killing a monster with a human head.

The discovery is of interest for the early history of Syracuse, and its importance might have proved greater had it been possible to explore the whole area. On top of the archaic cemetery were remains of Greek houses of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and nearer the modern surface-level of Hellenistic and Roman date.

The east, north, and west sides of the temple of Apollo have been completely liberated as far down as the beginning of the stereobate (Fig. 1). Unfortunately the west side, where the excavations of last April to June were carried on, and the opisthodomus have been destroyed by an enormous Spanish cistern. Part of the steps, however, remained in situ at the N.W. angle, and it is possible to establish with certainty the dimensions of the temple (58.25 by 24.50 m.). In the course of the excavations only one piece of a column and a few fragments of architectural terra-cottas were found; almost adjoining the lowest steps of the stylobate on the west front were the foundations of another building, perhaps of medieval date. We are now awaiting the liberation of the southern side, at present covered by old houses backing on to the cella wall which is still preserved to a large extent of its height.

At Castle Euryalus clearance work has been in progress in the enclosure in front of the keep in order better to show up the wall and towers of the castle. No noteworthy discoveries have been made except the finding of a few subterranean vaults, which were perhaps deposits for stores.

On the important find of three wooden xoana (Fig. 2) in the territory of *Palma Montechiaro* we have now the learned and thorough study of



FIG. 1.—THE TEMPLE OF APOLLO AT SYRACUSE.



FIG. 2.—XOANA FROM PALMA MONTECHIARO.

Dr. G. Caputo (*Mon. Ant.* 1938, pp. 586–684). They were found near a sulphur spring which in ancient times was probably the object of a cult. The finding of a number of statuettes and masks in terra-cotta, remains of pottery, and a pit for sacrifices connected with an οἶκος—where pieces of wooden framework, tiles and an ὀπαῖον have been found—is strong evidence in favour of this. The *favissa* which began towards the end of the seventh century B.C. must have continued until the beginning of the fifth, when the life of the sanctuary was cut short by the Punic invasions.

The three xoana (Fig. 2), also *ex-votos*, represent three standing female figures (16·7, 17·2, 18·8 cm. high respectively). The first differs from the other two, the polos being higher and narrower, the hair treated in another way, and the eyes consisting of small inserted pieces of wood. In all three Dr. Caputo notes the artist's attempt to liberate himself from purely geometric forms and follow a more naturalistic trend. From comparisons of these xoana with terra-cotta statuettes, he thinks that the first, which he dates at the end of the seventh century B.C., represents Persephone and the other two, dating from the first quarter of the sixth century, Demeter. This is probable not only from the essentially chthonic character of the sulphur spring, but because of the wide diffusion in Sicily of the cult of these two divinities.

At *Selinunte* Prof. Cultrera resumed in 1935 excavations to continue the exploration of the acropolis north of Temple D, and thus established contact with the excavations conducted by Gabrici in 1924–5 (*Mon. Ant.* xxxiii, 61 ff.). Cultrera has recently published his results (*NSc* 1937, 152 ff.). Of the thirty-six enclosures explored, only a few date from the classical period, the others belonging to a much later age. Little loose material was found except the upper part of a female statuette of daedalic type in hard limestone, a few fragments of coloured architectural terra-cottas and a fragment of a limestone slab, 27 cm. high, with a standing female figure in relief holding a duck in her right hand.

This year work was carried on in the area below the large temples, but was limited to the clearing of an area east of Temple E. During the moving of the large blocks a triglyph was discovered which had kept all its original blue colouring and had a simple red band under the taenia.

Works of preservation have been carried on in the Greek theatres of *Taormina* and *Tindari*. At *Taormina* the consolidation and readjustment of the cavea have been completed. Many Roman marble fragments, capitals and columns have been removed from the places where they were put during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for picturesque effects. Some preliminary excavations were made at the theatre of *Tindari* to check the plan made by Prof. Carta, which may now be seen at the exhibition of restorations in Rome.

At *Catania* the pulling down of some houses on top of the cavea of the Greek theatre has brought to light an important section of it, with remarkable constructions belonging to the period of the Roman transformation.

Dr. P. E. Arias in *NSc* 1937, 456 ff., discusses several discoveries made at different times at *Comiso*, and publishes two fine vases for the first time from photographs. They come from the S. Elia-Margi locality outside the

town, where the archaic Greek cemetery was situated. One is a b.f. hydria representing Apollo with his lyre and Artemis seated on lion-legged stools; the other is a r.f. column krater with the suitors bringing gifts to Penelope. Both are in the Syracuse Museum.

CALABRIA, LUCANIA, APULIA.

A plan of the fifth-century Greek walls of the city has been made at *Reggio Calabria* in order to assist in the tracing of their history through Roman and medieval times until the sixteenth century A.D., when they formed the nucleus for a Spanish fortification. Work was also carried out on the Greek walls of Hipponion (*Vibo Valentia*) to strengthen and preserve them.

In the territory of *Castellace*, near Oppido Mamertina, four early iron-age tombs were accidentally discovered during agricultural operations some 80 cm. below ground-level. Their contents were poor: lance-points, two-handled cups of rough paste, fibulae, amber beads and marbles of a bluish glass paste.

In Apulia the discoveries and excavations of the year were all of Roman date, though at *Lecce* operations in via Augusto Imperatore revealed some Messapic tombs.

At *Leporano*, near Taranto, an interesting neolithic settlement has recently been discovered and excavation is proceeding under the direction of Dr. Drago, director of the Taranto Museum.

CAMPANIA.

The many foreign dominations which followed one another in Naples, by their successive rebuildings of the town, completely obscured the Greek city, the topography of which, however, has been reconstructed by Bartolomeo Capasso after much patient research in the Archives. Of the powerful walls which Hannibal dared not besiege and which the Romans were able to storm only after a secret agreement with some of the nobles of Neapolis, only a few miserable remains exist, and when new portions are unearthed, the exigencies of modern town-planning prevent their remaining visible in situ. Last March, during some work in the Corso Umberto I, a longish stretch of the wall with large blocks of tufa (1.20–1.60 m. long; 80 cm. wide; 40 cm. high) was revealed. The blocks formed a double line, the space between filled with shapeless fragments of tufa, sand and pozzolana. The blocks were marked with letters of the Greek alphabet or geometrical signs.

Dr. Olga Elia in *NSc* 1937, pp. 101–143, describes the pottery of a group of Samnite tombs brought to light some years ago in the territories of *S. Antimo*, *Aversa* and *Frignano* as a result of excavations in connexion with the laying of the direct railway line from Rome to Naples. The tombs were scattered along an ancient way which connected Atella with the main Campanian road, and the richness of their contents testifies to the high standard of living current in those parts in the later fourth century B.C. All the pottery belongs to the fourth and early third centuries. The most

remarkable of the r.f. vases are a large amphora showing Eos rising from the sea in a chariot, a bell-krater with the birth of Helen from the egg in the presence of Leda and Tyndareos, an olpe with a banquet, and a squat lekythos showing Bellerophon receiving the fatal letter from Proetus. The vases are closely related to the Paestan style; some of them have actually been assigned to the so-called Caivano Group. All the material is now in the Naples Museum.

Dr. D. Mustilli has explored some Lucanian tombs not far from *Altavilla Silentina*, on the left side of the River Sele (*NSc* 1937, pp. 143-151). The tombs are coffin-shaped; the side-slabs were covered with plaster and painted, but the damp has caused the decorations to disappear. They contained numerous vases with figures in applied red, and fragments of a bronze belt and iron weapons. Dr. Mustilli relates the vases, despite their fragmentary condition, to those of the fabric of Paestum of the end of the fourth century.

Works in connexion with a *bonifica* on the right-hand side of the River Sele near Santa Cecilia have revealed the fossil remains of an elephant and a hippopotamus. These have been studied by Prof. De Lorenzo and Prof. D'Erasmus in the second volume of the *Rassegna Storica Salernitana*. In the same volume Prof. Patroni discusses recently discovered Paestan vases, of which he illustrates a number unpublished by or unknown to Trendall, and Prof. Marzullo describes the material from the Arenosola necropolis, mainly Geometric and Corinthian pottery. Arenosola was probably the site where in antiquity the River Sele flowed into the sea.

Material of the greatest importance for our knowledge of the art of Magna Graecia continues to be found in the sanctuary of Argive Hera, near the mouth of the River Sele, in the excavations conducted by Dr. P. Zancani-Montuoro and myself. A preliminary report on our results was recently published in the *Notizie degli Scavi* (1937, pp. 206-354). Digging farther in the area north of the small archaic temple or treasury, and west of the Stoa (Fig. 3), we found a tightly packed layer of fragments of archaic material (Corinthian and Attic b.f. pottery, with some bronze and iron objects). Upon this lay six metopes, with their triglyphs sculptured from the same block, belonging to the frieze of the treasury (*JHS* 1936, p. 230; 1937, p. 244). In many details the first is well preserved, but the central projecting portion of the sculptured figures is unfortunately missing. It represents two draped figures, probably female, hastening to the right. The first holds in her raised left hand a phiale, and carries in her right hand a tray with sacrificial offerings; she turns her head back with a look of despair at the other figure, who seems to be pursuing her. The second metope is perfectly preserved, and gives a better idea of all the details of the rendering than any other metope from this early archaic series. It represents a centaur leaping to the left; his front hoofs are raised from the ground, his left arm is stretched forward and the right hand lifted to clasp a branch. Part of the hand and branch at the top right corner of the metope are missing. The third metope, found with the sculptured surface upwards, is much damaged; it represents the struggle of Herakles with the Nemean lion. The fourth, also discovered face upwards and damaged




FIG. 3.—AERIAL PHOTO OF THE EXCAVATIONS OF THE ARGIVE HERAEUM AT THE MOUTH OF THE SELE.
X. SITE OF THE LATEST DISCOVERIES.



FIG. 4.—ARCHAIC MITOPE FROM THE HERAEUM.




FIG. 5.—ANTA CAPITALS OF THE THESACROS.

in the right half, shows a winged being carrying a partly deficient round object in a well-modelled and powerful arm, which ends in claws. The figure is represented running to the right, with its right knee on the ground in the conventional archaic scheme usually adopted for gorgons, but the bird's claws and some other details induce us to consider this mythical creature as a Harpy or perhaps a Boread. The four metopes just mentioned are all carved in round relief, with a very accurate rendering of the anatomy, as in the metopes 1, 4, 5 and 6 described in my last report (*JHS* 1937, pp. 244 f.).

Continuing the digging still farther to the north, we found, among the usual fragments of archaic pottery, two other metopes with the corresponding triglyphs, the sculptured surfaces upwards, but in a good state of preservation. Both represent two Silens with hoofs and horses' tails running to left; their arms are raised, apparently in the act of throwing stones. The figures are done in flat relief, and in the first metope one is almost precisely superimposed on the other, so as to appear almost a projection from it; similarly in the other, except that here the left arm of one silen turns up, that of the other down.

The first metope was found leaning against the south-west corner of a new building, which extends from west to east, with an entrance on the south side. It is almost exactly in line with the Stoa, and consists of a large hall flanked on the east side by a smaller room of which the eastern external wall is lacking. It measures 23.93 m. long by 7.20 wide. The foundation is much more primitive than that of the Stoa, being composed of a layer of limestone blocks of various sizes, on which there must have risen walls of crude brick in wooden frames. We have, in fact, discovered near to and inside this building compact masses of burnt clay and fragments of charred wood. The fact that the level of this building is lower than that of the Stoa, and that the material found on the ground floor was entirely archaic, leads us to suppose that it is contemporary with the thesauros, and was destroyed together with it during that event which overthrew a large part of the sanctuary at the end of the fifth or in the middle of the fourth century B.C. Its function seems to have been identical with that of the Stoa which took its place.

Amongst the most noteworthy objects found in and around this building are some tall Corinthian lekythoi with animal decorations, a small Geometric askos with tiny bumps, an oenochoe of glass paste, some Attic b.f. kylikes and a gold earring. A little distance away was a half triglyph in the middle of some sandstone rubble, probably much damaged relics of portions of the same frieze.

Thus of the twenty-three reliefs which, not counting numerous fragments, have been brought to light, the most archaic sculptures are the most numerous (fifteen) and representative. All the reliefs will be published in a special volume in 1939.

UMBERTO ZANOTTI-BIANCO.

NOTES

The Centenary of the Archaeological Society of Athens.—The Archaeological Society of Athens was founded on 6th January, 1837 (O.S.); but the celebration of its Centenary was postponed till 23rd October, 1938, so as not to clash with that of the Centenary of the University, which was celebrated last year. Delegates from many countries were present, including four British representatives: Mr. Gerard M. Young, director of the British Archaeological School, who represented that institution, the University of Cambridge and the Society of Antiquaries; Dr. William Miller, who represented the British Academy; Mr. R. D. Barnett, who represented the British Museum and the Hellenic Society; and Dr. Routh, who represented the University of London. The programme began with a meeting in the Parthenon, where the King and the Prime Minister spoke, and M. Oikonomos, general secretary of the Society, gave an interesting summary of its history. It is characteristic of the Greeks that barely three years after Athens became the capital, they thought of such intellectual things as University education and archaeology, including, first of all, the preservation of their ancient monuments, to which attention had been paid even during the War of Independence by the National Assemblies of Troizen and Argos, and for which a museum was founded at Aegina by Capo d'Istria, and in the Thesceion by the Royal Government in 1835, while in 1837 Ludwig Ross was appointed the first professor of Archaeology at the University. M. Oikonomos recalled another characteristic fact, that a Macedonian, established in Vienna, Baron Belios, was at the head of the 67 founders of the Society, the first organisation of which was drawn up by Alexander Rhangabes. The first General Assembly was held in the Parthenon, like the Centenary gathering, and among the members of the first administrative Council was a Scotsman resident at Athens, Skene of Rubslaw, whose daughter married Thomson, Archbishop of York. Thus, as M. Oikonomos said, from the first moment Greece welcomed the cooperation of foreigners in archaeological research, as she has continued to do. He then summarised the century's work of the Society, beginning with the reconstruction of the temple of Nike Apteros by Ross, Schaubert and Hansen—a work now being repeated by M. Balanos. The creation of the lottery in 1874

provided funds for work outside Athens, at Epidauros, Eleusis and other archaeological sites, and for the erection of museums, of which that of Athens was largely due to the generosity of two national benefactors, Bernardakes and Helene Tossitsa. On the day following the meeting in the Parthenon there was a gathering at the Academy, at which the King, Princes Andrew and Christopher, and Princesses Irene and Catherine were present. Thirty-five speeches by Greek and foreign delegates were delivered, the speakers usually employing their own language, though the Egyptian spoke in English, the Roumanian in French. There were seven German orators, headed by Dr. Dörpfeld; the British had one spokesman, Mr. Young, who tactfully alluded to the hearty collaboration of the peasants with the foreign excavators. The United States Minister, Mr. MacVeagh, the restorer of the Lion of Amphipolis, spoke for the Americans. Wreaths were laid upon the cenotaph of the Unknown Warrior and the new statue of King Constantine, a former President of the Society. There were two public dinners and a luncheon, given by M. Kotzias, the Governor of Athens. Rain unfortunately prevented the performance of the *Electra* in the Odeion of Herodes Atticus and the out-door luncheon at Daphni, and hindered the excursion to Epidauros, but some delegates went to Eleusis, and there was a performance of 'King Lear' in modern Greek at the Royal theatre. Visits to the various Museums and to Plato's Academy completed the programme, which extended over five days. The gold medal of the Academy was conferred upon the Society, which, in its turn, conferred honours upon numerous foreigners. Among these were the following ten Britons, who received diplomas with the respective grades of 'honorary councillors,' 'honorary members,' and 'corresponding members':—

Sir Arthur Evans.	Sir John Forsdyke.
Sir James Frazer.	Mr. Gerard M.
Sir Frederick Kenyon.	Young.
Dr. William Miller.	Mr. R. D. Barnett.
Sir William Ramsay.	Mr. T. J. Dunbabin.
Prof. J. D. Beazley.	

There was issued an alphabetical catalogue of all the Society's excavations, other work and publications, 1837–1937.

W. MILLER.

The Chatsworth Head.¹—In his interesting and important article on this head, Professor Wace assumes that the left ear was always exposed, and says: 'There seems to be no actual right ear. It was apparently meant to be imagined as hidden in the mass of curls.' Such asymmetry is most surprising in a work of this period. As Professor Wace's article is likely to remain the principal reference for the head, it is important to observe that this theory cannot be taken as an established fact. I have examined the head after reading Professor Wace's article, but still believe with Furtwängler that the right ear exists under the curls, and that the left was originally similarly covered. First, though the left ear is unnecessarily complete for a hidden feature, it is strangely crude if meant to be seen. Second, the back view (Pl. IX, 1) shows even more clearly than the front (Pl. VIII, 1) that a group of curls on the left, corresponding exactly to Professor Wace's piece B on the right, would easily cover the ear; or to put it the other way, that there is plenty of room under the curls on the right for an ear as complete as the left. Third, Professor Wace writes: 'A lump of metal can be seen from the front under the short curls on the right, but this can hardly be the lobe of an ear, for it is set lower down than the left ear.' But it looks like a lobe, and many even fully frontal statues show as great a difference of level between the ears, e.g. the Peplos Kore (Payne, *Acropolis Sculpture*, Pl. 32; there are other examples in this book), and if, as Professor Wace suggests, the head was turned, the difference is even less surprising. Such asymmetries of execution are a constant feature of archaic and early classical heads, but a staringly asymmetrical fashion of hair-dressing is to seek.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

British Museum.

A Group of Plastic Vases.—(*JHS* lviii, pp. 41 ff.). Fragments of two vases in the form of dead hares were found at Lindos (Blinkenberg, nos. 1934-5, pl. 85). These are certainly not Corinthian; Blinkenberg describes the fabric of 1934 as 'terre rouge fine' and that of 1935 as 'terre d'un chamois rougeâtre,' and compares the Copenhagen vase, my no. 12. If these fragments belong to the group, the theory of an Italian origin cannot stand. On the other

hand, I pointed out that the dead hare in Berlin (no. 13) has a vase-mouth differing in form and decoration from those of the rest of the group, and also lacks the distinctive colouring of the ears. It is therefore possible to detach it from the group, and suppose that vases of this type were made in two centres besides Corinth. The Lindos fragments lack ears and vase-mouth, and so cannot be definitely placed. If they go with the Berlin vase, the Italian origin of the rest of the group can still be supported. The Lindos head, however, looks in illustration more like those of the vases in Copenhagen and the Vatican (no. 11) than of that in Berlin, while the latter was found at Vulci, and so formed part of the balance of evidence for an Italian origin. The question remains open, but the probability is that the Lindos fragments belong, and so that the group was not made in Italy.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

*British Museum,
London.*

A Jewish Gold Medallion.—The object in Fig. 1 is a circular medallion of sheet gold embossed with Jewish symbols recently presented to the Jewish Museum, Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place. In the centre is the seven-branched candlestick familiar on Jewish monuments of antiquity. With it are associated, as usual, the Shofâr or Trumpet of horn, and the luláb or ritual sheaf of palm leaves, etc., used on the Festival of Tabernacles. The representation of the luláb here is somewhat angular, so that it is not easy to recognise. For such medallions cf. Reifenberg, *Denkmäler der Jüdischen Antike* pl. 56 and for the symbols, Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*.

Above the symbols is inscribed in Greek letters of late date: ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗC ΙΑΚΩΒ ΑΡΧΙΓΟΥ ΠΙΝΝΩΝΑ. 'Ex voto of Jacob the Leader (?) the setter of pearls.' The word ἀρχηγός may perhaps be used in the sense of ἀρχισυνάγωγός, the president of the community, but such a use is unfamiliar; indeed the word does not seem to occur in Byzantine Greek. Mr. Tod has kindly suggested that it might be the dedicant's alternative name, like Dorcas—Tabitha, since such a name as Ἀρχων is possible. Πιννωνᾶ will be the genitive of a word Πιννωνᾶς, also an unexampled word, but one which appears correctly formed. The strange genitive in -ᾶ follows correctly a usage in Byzantine Greek in names of trades ending in -ᾶς.²

¹ The Duke of Devonshire has kindly given me permission to examine the head, now on loan at the British Museum, and to publish this note.

² B. Olsson, *Die Gewerbenamen auf -ās in den Papyri, in Aegyptus*, VI, 247-9.

The date of the plaque seems to be after the fifth century.

R. D. BARNETT.

*British Museum,
London.*

An Inscription from Kythera.—While collecting information about the early history of Kythera I recently came across a short communication from Leake in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, Vol. IV (new series), 1853. It is in the form of a letter to the Secretary, and entitled 'Some remarks on the Island

scholar interested in Minoan or early Asia Minor scripts seems to have any knowledge of it. Some, but not all, of the signs are found in the Minoan linear script, a few also in the Cypriote syllabary. It is perhaps most probable that it will be proved to be Minoan, as other Cretan objects have been found in the island (*e.g.*, the M.M.I stone vase found in an L.H. tomb, Stais, 'Αρχ. Δελτ. 1, 1915, p. 192, fig. 1); on the other hand, if Mr. Calucci is correct in saying the material is stone, it would be a unique example of a Minoan inscription on a stone tablet, though there are, of course, several on stone vessels, libation-tables, etc. Mr. J. D. S.



FIG. 1.—JEWISH GOLD MEDALLION.

Cerigo, anciently Cythera,' and reproduces an extract translated by Mr. Hamilton from a Memoir on the island sent to the latter by Mr. Calucci, an inhabitant of Kythera, on Oct. 3rd, 1849. On p. 4 he gives a copy of an inscribed stone found at Palaiopoli (Scandeia) which he describes thus: 'A small rectangular piece of hard white stone, one inch (sic) in length and ten lines thick; its lower surface has deep cuttings in it so as to form five half cylinders. On the upper surface, which is highly polished, is the inscription in five lines represented in the annexed drawing (Fig. 2). The measurement given appears impossibly small and must be a mistranslation of the original Greek (or Italian).

The paper is known to Pauly-Wissowa. Weil (*AM* v, 1880, pp. 293 f.) mentions it and copies the late Greek inscription also illustrated there, but takes no notice of our inscription, and no




FIG. 2.—INSCRIPTION FROM KYTHERA.

Pendlebury suggested to me that the material might be clay whitened by fire, but the high polish seems to be against this. It is in the hope that some light may be cast on the inscription by epigraphists or philologists that I republish it here.

H. THOMAS.

*Girton College,
Cambridge.*

Attic Black-figured Lekythoi.—From Mrs. A. D. Ure's exhaustive review of my *Attic Black-figured Lekythoi* in the last volume of *JHS* (57, pp. 263-5), I realise that for the sake of brevity I must often have been less clear than I ought to have been, so that certain passages in my book call for explanation.

'The dearth of material for the years following 530' (*JHS* 57, p. 264) is only apparent. There is the Phanyllis class (*ABL* 63-8), which belongs roughly to the period 520-500, although examples occur both before and after; it was placed at the end of its chapter for the sole reason that the stuff is second-rate, and therefore less important, and not because it is later than other items in this chapter and the foregoing one. On the contrary, it covers a long space of time.

We should turn to *ABL* 16-8 and 35-7 to see the points from which these groups start. Their terminus *ante quem* is given on pp. 63-8: in these pages I discuss the groups at the last possible moment—I admit—but they do not deserve a better treatment. The larger, chief types tack on to such lekythoi as Athens 371 and London B 571 (see *ABL* 63 and 36) in style and decoration, as well as in date. The lesser ones are followers of such small lekythoi as the 'fat runner' group (offshoot of the Dolphin class): for some examples see *ABL* 17, below: the groups themselves are discussed on pp. 66-8.

The Phanyllis Painter was certainly active about 520 (see *ABL* 64 and note 1): his voluteless bf. palmettes are exactly like those on the r.f. Pamphaios cup in the British Museum (E 12), and there is a link with a Nicosthenic Pamphaios-Oltos neck-amphora in the Louvre (G 2). This points to 520, which is the date of his Delos lekythos with the Phanyllis inscription (*ABL* Appendix VII, A, no. 1). But his prime falls later, when his style gets less dry and more fluent; see *ABL* pl. 19, 1 and Appendix VII, A, nos. 9-31. The Chariot Painter has links with Nikosthenes (*ABL* 66), which again suggests a date of c. 520. I had dated the Delos lekythos of the Chariot Painter (*ABL* Appendix VII, C, no. 2) at c. 525. The 'hoplite-leaving-home' type starts about 530, the date of the Trebenishte lekythos (*ABL* 67), but goes on to the end of the century or near. I have recently seen a few more late examples at the Corinth excavations.

With all these groups I had not mentioned the dates separately in my text, because their connexions with contemporaries and predecessors had put them in their contexts. As an exception I drew special attention to the date of the 'cock class,' 510-490 (*ABL* 68), because among these groups this is the latest. To be clear, I should perhaps have added that this is the most prolific time, but that they were made before this (see the one connected with the 'fat runner' group, *ABL* 17), as well as after.

So much for the lekythoi after 530. The second point—the dating of the Rhitsona

'group B' graves (*JHS* 57, p. 265)—is in some ways related to the first. The rather compressed form in which I have given the result of my study (*ABL* 108-10) again seems to have led to misunderstandings. In examining these graves we paid special attention to the latest pieces among the contents (*ABL* 108). Accordingly, for example in grave 31, I enumerate the b.f. contents without comment (which means that as they are earlier they do not need discussion)—except for three pieces, which are the latest in the grave of which I discuss the dating, being about 500. This puts grave 31 about 500, or slightly later, *but not so* all the b.f. contents of the grave, only the above-mentioned three pieces. In fact, most of the lekythoi in grave 31 are pre-Leagros. And so are the two skyphoi of the 'White Heron group' (early), nos. 173 and 172: they were made in the 'White Heron workshop,' but fall before the Theseus Painter (that is what I meant by 'early' added in brackets). The Theseus Painter had been the inspirer of his fellow-painters in the 'Heron workshop' (*ABL* 142-4); but that workshop apparently turned out skyphoi before he joined: these can be recognised as from the 'Heron workshop' by their shape and accessory decoration (ivy on the lip, red and black tongues at the base), and by their love of white, and especially of yellow (*ABL* 143).

Thus, in reality, we are not confronted by the puzzle 'why they should stop making lekythoi for about fifteen years in Athens.' The manufacture goes on in a steady flow. 'Why they should stop having funerals for about thirty years at Mykalessos' is, of course, another problem. To sum up: instead of all falling into one decade, the b.f. contents of the Rhitsona 'group B' graves are spread over at least thirty-odd years. But they were put in the grave at a date later than the youngest vase among them. On the whole it is not surprising if the contents of a grave appear to differ greatly in date—especially in Boeotia. In Athens one can expect a unity like that of the Haimon-Douris grave (*ABL* 132-3), and even more so in the Marathon burial (*ABL* 91-3 and 77): with the workshops on the spot, people just bought a whole lot at the moment they needed them for the funeral; and so, of course, the grave-contents were apt to be contemporary. In Boeotia, on the other hand, import as well as buying conditions must have been rather irregular.

Lastly, a word on 'black Six lekythoi of little-lion shape' (*JHS* 57, p. 265; *ABL* 108). For this expression see *ABL* 107: 'The plain

black lekythoi from the workshop of our painters go with those in Six's technique. Though they have no picture, there is always a pattern or two red lines above, and a red line below.' This red line is a ground-line, such as we find in the pictures in Six's technique, and it suggests that originally a picture in Six's technique was meant to be painted on it. If this picture was omitted, the intention was there; so I ranged them with the Sixes (also in the Appendices)—the ground-line being, after all, in Six's technique. Such black little-lion lekythoi cannot have been made in the Sappho workshop before the Sappho Painter joined it—just because of that ground-line: it was made to put Six pictures on; and as we have no Six lekythoi of this shape before the Sappho Painter, it must have been he who started them. Moreover, these black lekythoi were not earlier than those in Six's technique, the Six picture being left out as an after-thought.

In the Sappho-Diosphos workshop we have three main groups of lekythoi: bulkier lekythoi of the shape used by the Sappho Painter (*ABL* 94 and pl. 32: 33; 35, 1 and 36, 3), slenderer pieces of the Diosphos Painter's shape (*ABL* 94 and pl. 36, 4: 38, 2-6 and 39, 1), and thirdly, those of little-lion shape (*ABL* 98 and pl. 35, 3; 36, 1 and 40). Each group is subdivided in b. f. (with 'semi-outline'), Six's technique, and black. In all three groups the plain black specimens cannot be earlier than the others. The little-lion shape, with its straight, shallow mouth and 'compromise' base, is an old-fashioned revival. The black specimens show their contemporaneity with the Sixes and the b. f. ones by their shoulder-decoration of post-Leagros lotus-buds—apart from the above-mentioned ground-line. They have both features in common with the black lekythoi of the Sappho Painter's shape and those of the Diosphos Painter's shape. Characteristic of all the products of this workshop are the fine red clay and the glossy black paint; and they all persist to the last (c. 480) in an otherwise out-dated feature—namely, in having the top side of the mouth painted black, with dark red added over the black (*ABL* 94).

In this interwoven ensemble it seems fundamentally impossible to lift out one group, the black little lions, and put them elsewhere—i.e., earlier. Mrs. Ure quotes an example—and she says there are others—of a black little lion found in the same grave as a lekythos of c. 530 (*JHS* 57, p. 265). As opposed to this we have a convincing number of instances of black little lions appearing in contexts of c. 500, for

example, in the excavations of the Agora at Athens: one of them being found with lekythoi belonging to the group of Athens 496 (related to the Sappho-Diosphos work): I mentioned these Agora vases in *ABL* 119. In this question of the black little lions—as often—I had given my conclusions, without retracing the way that had led to them.

C. H. EMILIE HASPELS.

Istanbul.

Miss Haspels' welcome note printed above shows that the gap that I saw in her series of lekythos types in the years succeeding 530 does not, in fact, exist. She shows here that the types which I suggested should be put into these apparently empty years (the earlier Phanyllis-shaped lekythoi, the 'hoplite-leaving-home' class, early 'cocks' and such like) actually do, in her view, belong to that period, and she gives dates which supplement and clarify her previous account. The result is that the differences between her dating of the lekythoi of this period and that of the Rhitsona excavators are reduced to quite small dimensions. To take once more the dating of Rhitsona grave 31, which is the crux of the matter, it will be seen from the above note that the b. f. evidence set out in *ABL* 108 does not 'as a whole' date the grave to 500 or slightly later; for Miss Haspels here says that she regards most of the lekythoi in this grave as pre-Leagros. Since the excavators have dated the grave contents as a whole about 520, the 'serious complication' caused by the 'discrepancy' between the b. f. vases and the rest of the grave contents (*ABL* 110) turns out not to be so very serious, after all. The lekythoi which suggest to Miss Haspels a date so late as 500 are, she says, only three—no. 158 'near the Phanyllis Painter' and two black little lions. (There are actually six black lekythoi of little-lion shape in grave 31, nos. 210-15, *Sixth and Fifth* p. 54, P1 and P2, but that does not affect the argument.) It is undoubtedly true that black little lions were made in the shop where the Sappho and the Diosphos Painters and their assistants worked, but I am not at all convinced by the argument that they could not have been made until after the Sappho Painter had started painting in the Six technique. The red lines Miss Haspels speaks of as being in Six's technique had been for decades a common convention on black-bodied lekythoi, and derive from the red line beneath early black-figure scenes. An example is Rhitsona 49.250 (*BSA* XIV, pl. IX g; *Sixth and Fifth* 42), from a grave dated by the excavators mid-sixth century and by Miss Haspels 'not

much earlier than 540' (*ABL* 5), where there are red lines on the black body in just the same position as on the black little lions. When the Sappho Painter came to paint figures in Six's technique on these black lekythoi, he merely made use of the red ground-line with which tradition had already supplied him. I still hold the opinion that the black-bodied little lions, with their early type of lip, white petals on the shoulder and red ground-line all pointing back to work of the third quarter of the sixth century were being made for some years before the Sappho Painter took to painting 'Six' figures upon them—made possibly by one of the more elderly of the subordinates whom Miss Haspels thinks of (*ABL* 95) as painting the shoulder decoration on lekythoi of which the body was decorated by the more skilful hands of the Sappho Painter himself.

So in my view there remains only one lekythos (the rather abnormal no. 158, *Sixth and Fifth*, Pl. XIV) out of more than 360 vases in grave 31 which seems to call for a later date. It is near the Phanyllis Painter, and although the Phanyllis Painter was active about 520, it resembles his later work rather than his earlier. But we cannot close our eyes to the evidence of the rest of the grave contents. The

value of the Rhitsona graves, as compared with the cemeteries of, say, Sicily or Rhodes, is that we frequently have not dozens but hundreds of vases buried on a single occasion, and mere numbers tell us what types were in fashion and what were not. In this case the rest of the very numerous grave contents are in favour of a date well back in the last quarter of the sixth century. The problem of this one apparently later vase cannot be settled on purely subjective grounds. It is at least equally possible to argue that the evidence of its context goes to show that this particular lekythos is not so late as the style of the drawing might suggest: a view that can be supported by its slight abnormality and by the fact which emerges from any study of vases in the mass—that not every vase of a given type need be so late as the floruit of its type.

It still seems highly doubtful whether Miss Haspels is right in dating the earliest of the Rhitsona 'group B' burials in the fifth century and crowding into a single decade the whole series discussed by her *ABL* 108–10, which we should space over a period of roughly twenty-five years: but we entirely concur with her conclusion that the b.f. lekythoi from these graves cover a space of at least thirty-odd years, beginning in the pre-Leagros period.

A. D. ÜRE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Die Träger der Kretisch-Mykenischen Kultur, ihre Herkunft und ihre Sprache.

I Teil: Urgriechen und Urillyrier (Thrako-Illyrier). By V. GEORGIEV.

(Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté Historico-Philologique, Tome xxxiii. 4.) Pp. 204. Sofia: Imprimerie de la Cour. 1937.

The author holds that down to the second half of the fourth millennium B.C. Greece, Crete and the Islands were uninhabited or only sparsely inhabited. Then they were invaded by the 'Bandkeramik' people from the western side of the Balkan peninsula. This people was Proto-Illyrian with some admixture of Thracians. The latter, however, were few. These invaders established themselves throughout the Aegean area, including the west coast of Asia Minor, and developed their culture there without any break down to the twelfth century B.C.

The author bases his case principally on philology which I am not competent to test. He thinks that the pre-hellenic words and place names collected by Kretschmer and Fick are all good Indo-European and that in particular the *-ssos* and *-nthos* terminations are not only Indo-European, but specifically Proto-Illyrian. He supports his theory by references to archaeology, but he rarely quotes a first-hand authority such as an excavation report, and usually draws his arguments from second-hand sources, the syntheses of Aegean prehistory compiled by various scholars. His theory involves the following archaeological assumptions. The culture of the Aegean area throughout the Neolithic and Bronze Ages was uniform and underwent a continuous development, though some parts of the area enjoyed at times a higher culture than the rest. There was no break between Neolithic and Early Helladic or between Early and Middle Helladic. Cretan Neolithic and Mainland Neolithic were products of the same culture and race. The Minyan Ware of the Mainland indicates a Trojan hegemony. The Trojans were Tyrsenians and the Etruscans were thus Illyrian colonists in Italy.

The Greeks he thinks entered Greece in the 12th century and came from Germany, Bohemia and Hungary and were of the Lausitz culture and used 'Buckelkeramik.' One branch of

them overran Asia Minor and overthrew the Hittite Empire. The other branch invaded Greece, where it settled and brought the Proto-Illyrian (Aegean) culture to an end. This was the Dorian migration. These newcomers practised cremation whereas the Proto-Illyrians were an inhumation folk. If archaeological facts have the value usually assigned to them then the author's views cannot be upheld, for they are archaeologically impossible. Can they be supported philologically? In addition to his insufficient acquaintance with first hand archaeological literature the author seems also unaware of the anthropological work of Fürst and Koumares.

A. J. B. WACE.

Sparta und Messenien. By J. KROYMANN. (Neue Philol. Untersuch. XI. 1937.) Pp. xxxiv + 115. Berlin. 1937. RM. 9.

The author, a disciple of Werner Jaeger, accepts as the foundation of his study the views expressed in Jaeger's article 'Tyrtaios über die wahre Arete' (*SB Berl., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1932). He proceeds to demonstrate, by a critical examination of the later literary sources, that these afford no support for the belief, first put forward by Eduard Schwartz in 1899, that the poems of Tyrtæus themselves, as well as the events ascribed to the second Messenian War, are politically inspired inventions of the fourth century B.C., following upon the liberation of Messenia. It is due to Schwartz to say that he has recently modified his view in an article (*Philologus* xcii. i, pp. 19 ff.) which appeared at the same time as Kroymann's publication, and that he would now probably agree with Kroymann that the historical importance of Pausanias' source the epic poet Rhianos has been exaggerated. Kroymann's detailed examination of the story of Aristomenes as related by Rhianos reveals that Rhianos knew the poems of Tyrtæus, and knew that they belonged to the seventh century B.C.; he did not scruple to alter evidence which he found there, to alter Thucydides' account of the founding of Messana, and to invent early connections between the Messenians and Rhodes, to suit the purpose of his

epic. The contribution made to Pausanias' account by native Messenian writers seeking to glorify the history of their country is also fully discussed, the Hellenistic admiration for Olympic victors being amusingly revealed in the process.

It does not form part of the plan of this book to discuss the historical aspects of the Messenian Wars, or the evidence of archaeology, but it serves the useful purpose of enabling us to accept the evidence of Tyrtaeus without misgiving. The hypothesis of a long Messenian War early in the fifth century B.C. is now shown to be without foundation.

K. M. T. ATKINSON.

Pericles. By COMPTON MACKENZIE. Pp. 351: two maps. London, 1937. 18s.

The excessive price of this work will prevent it being studied as widely as it deserves. Mr. Mackenzie, with a sincere belief in the greatness of his subject, has produced a very readable popular treatment of Pericles, in a pleasantly vigorous style, characterised by an admirable admixture of general information on the social, political, economic and religious aspects of fifth-century Athens, by some interesting parallels from modern politics, and by certain attractive original suggestions.

After a summary treatment of the earlier history of the Alcmaeonid family in Chapter I, he gives, in the succeeding chapters, a consecutive treatment of Athenian history in the fifth century, arranged around the figure of Pericles. In separate chapters he digresses to discuss Sparta and the Spartan constitution, the constitution, political and legal organisation of Athens, religion, economics, the public works undertaken by Pericles, and Aspasia.

The whole is welded together by the constantly recurring theme, the 'Imperialism' of Pericles, and the ever-present opposition of the conservative party, with its pro-Spartan bias. Mr. Mackenzie has definite views on the chronology relating to the prosecutions instituted against the friends and associates of the great statesman, and sees in them attempts to use existing religious and social prejudices for political purposes.

It would be unreasonable to criticise points of detail in a popular work such as the present; they do not affect the quality of the book as a whole. There are some doubtful forms in the spelling of proper names, and some minor errors and contradictions might have been avoided by more careful proof-reading.

R. J. HOPPER.

The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle; Volume II. By R. J. BONNER and GERTRUDE SMITH. Pp. vi + 320. University of Chicago Press, 1938. 16s.

The first volume of the present work was devoted to a detailed consideration of the origin and evolution of legal processes among the Greeks, down through the age of the law-givers, as a background to the development of the Solonian Heliaca into the highly-organised dicasteries of the fourth century. In treating the Athenian legal system in Volume I, the main theme was the machinery employed for administering justice (Volume I, p. vii).

For Volume II have been reserved the detailed examination of practice and procedure, and the many questions which arise in connexion with them. The writers do not profess the same minute treatment as is contained in Lipsius, Meier-Schömann: *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, but claim to add corrections, give re-discussions and amplify the questions arising in the latter work. This is a modest claim, for in reality the present work is far more useable than *Das Attische Recht*, and gives somewhat fuller authorities and references: while as a handbook for general use it is far less expensive than Lipsius.

In Chapter I the writers treat the origin and character (public and private) of various suits, the causes of the development of new suits when legal organisation became more complicated, and of more detailed suits from those of a more general nature. Attempts are made to establish the dates at which such changes and developments took place. In the following chapter consideration is given to the origin and establishment of the common right of prosecution, in the absence of the office of Public Prosecutor. Instances are cited, in public suits of great moment, of the appointment of prosecutors by the State when voluntary action was lacking. A closely reasoned account is given of the evolution of the function of professional advocate and speech-writer, and the consequent appearance of the professional legal adviser, from the part played as supporters (*συνήγοροι*) by friends of either side in a legal action. In connexion with the assistance rendered by voluntary 'advocates,' as in treating the problems of divulgation of evidence and suborning of witnesses, the writers correctly emphasise the influence exerted by the 'club' organisations, of wealthy citizens in particular, in Athens of the fifth century. It is shown that the more complex organisation of the jury-courts in the fourth century rendered these

courts less liable to bribery and intimidation (though it is doubtful whether either could be used to any great extent in view of the size of the courts). Recourse was then had to false charges to arouse public opinion, to extravagant suggestions and appeals, and to the use of the *προβολή* in the Ecclesia. In their treatment of the prosecution of financial officials, the writers seem to feel a certain amount of uncertainty. They reject the possibility of the existence of under-officials permanently employed by one Board, though it is admitted that such assistants might pass from Board to Board. It seems better to accept the permanency of under-officials, who in some cases might even be slaves. These could give expert advice to the *λογισταί* and *συνήγοροι*, and preserve continuity of practice in complicated details of administration. The translation of Aristophanes, *Wasps* 960-1 (page 28, bottom), seems more than doubtful. Here *λόγος* surely means 'speech' not 'account.' In Chapter III, in dealing with Sycophants, it is made clear that many of the abuses associated with this class of prosecutor derived from the monetary gain possible in successful prosecutions, and from the possibilities of private vengeance, while the practice of using the function of prosecutor to gain experience in public speaking may have contributed something to the prevalence of sycophancy. The writers show that the evil reached a high pitch in the second half of the fifth century (witness its suppression by the Thirty), and continued in the fourth century. Such legislation as was introduced to combat sycophancy in particular, and vexatious litigation in general, does not seem to have checked it. The general anxiety to secure prosecutors appears to have prevented the full enforcement of the laws, for the Athenians apparently followed the principle that it was better for many to suffer unjust charges than that one guilty person should escape. The vexed question whether metics could act as sycophants is left rather uncertain, though the authors incline to the opinion that they could. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1040-2, and the scholia thereto, throw little light on the problem. A correction should be made on p. 45, note 5: *ἐσυκοφάντει Μεγαρέων τὰ χλανίσκια* (Aristophanes, *Acharn.*, 519); the older and more common interpretation, connecting the reference with the manufacture and export of slaves' clothing at Megara (cp. Xen. *Mem.* ii 7, 6), must be the correct one; there can be no question of the concealment of contraband in such exiguous garments!

The two succeeding chapters are taken up with an account of two important forms of legal

procedure, Special Pleas (Chapter IV) and Arbitration (Chapter V). Both subjects are accorded the fullest possible discussion, and many disputed points are treated at length, in particular the problem whether cases referred to the 'Forty' were alone subject to arbitration, or whether other cases also came before the *δισαιτητα*. It is mentioned briefly that mercantile suits, as *ἐμμηνοί δίκαι*, were not subject to arbitration, and it seems a pity that the opportunity was not taken here or in a separate chapter to discuss *δίκαι ἐμπορικά* and *δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων*, and the problems connected with these (e.g., the successive jurisdictions of *ναυτοδίκαι* and *θεσμοθέται*). On the question of the categories of cases subject to arbitration, we may note (for what it is worth) a further reference not mentioned in this chapter: Bekker, *Anec. Gr.* I 310: *οἱ δισαιτητα πᾶσαν δίκην δικάζουσι πλὴν τῶν ξενικῶν*.

In Chapter VI consideration is given to the various problems connected with witnesses, their standing, the competence of slaves, women and children as such, the means adopted to secure the testimony of witnesses, and extra-judicial depositions. This is followed in Chapter VII by a consideration of oaths, their development from the simple forms of promissory and evidentiary oaths, and their use in various departments of Athenian legal procedure. Lengthy treatment is accorded to the origin and development of compurgation, and the function of 'oath-helpers,' who swore to their confidence in the oath of the principal. The practice is regarded as a development of the evidentiary oath, having its basis in the solidarity of the family. The writers then examine survivals of the practice in Greek (non-Athenian) practice, and produce good arguments against the interpretation of *ἐπωμόται* in this sense in the Oianthea and Chaleum inscription (Tod 63). Some slight traces of the practice in Athenian procedure are then noticed.

In the discussion of Homicide of various degrees, in the following chapter (VIII), it is asserted that *ποινή* or 'blood-money' was the underlying principle in murder cases in the earlier period, while the sense of pollution came later, and was not so strong. It is shown, indeed, that the idea of pollution in the classical period seems to have arisen first when proceedings had been instituted against the offender. The authors say, 'The whole matter of pollution in homicide looks like a sort of legalised pollution, which was foisted on homicide proceedings by religion for various reasons.' There was, however, an important distinction made between murder outside the family and murder of a member of it. In the

latter case the sense of abhorrence and pollution was very strong. No doubt the application of the idea of pollution to homicide outside the family was due to the extension of social conscience from the clan or family to a wider organisation. Further consideration is given to the problems of pollution in justifiable homicide, the obligation of relations or phratry of a murdered man to prosecute his murderer, and evidence in homicide cases, where it is decided that the evidence of women was accepted, while that of slaves was not.

A treatment of Appeals, Pardons and New Trials, and of Execution of Judgments, appears in the two following chapters (IX and X). In the first of these a long and valuable discussion of ἐφεσις is given, with its alternative meanings of 'appeal' and 'reference,' both in the Athenian judicial procedure and in the Athenian Empire in cases involving members of subject States. In the latter connexion it is concluded that ἐφεσις in the Chalcis decree (Tod 42) refers to compulsory reference of certain cases to Athens. A longer statement than a mere footnote (referring to Volume I) might have been made here on ἐφέσιμοι δίκαι in the Second Athenian League. The officials called 'ἐπίσκοποι' are mentioned in connexion with the possibility of the existence, in the allied States, of Athenian officials who determine which cases were to be referred to Athens. It seems very doubtful whether the ἐπίσκοποι can be regarded as 'related to the imperial judicial system,' and as exercising permanent functions, since in the case of Erythrae (Tod 29), at any rate, they had to do with the organisation of the constitution (cp. the committee sent to Miletus, *IG*. I 2, 22), and such functions would suit very well the reference in Aristophanes, *Birds* 1032, 1053. In the final chapter we are given a general estimate of Athenian justice, in which the authors seem to take a view favourable rather than otherwise of the working of the Athenian judicial system.

It may be observed here that another chapter, containing a treatment of the position of foreigners in legal matters and the position and importance of προστάται, would have been a valuable addition to the book. The whole work is characterised by an admirable fullness of discussion, with abundant references to authorities ancient and modern. Very many important passages are quoted in full in the original or in standard translations. There appears to be a high standard of accuracy in references and quotations. On p. 169 (Dem. xxiii 67-71) correct δπαντας to δπαντες; and on p. 183, μάρτυρ to μάρτυς. There is a full index, but a

bibliography has been omitted, probably on account of the dimensions it would assume.

R. J. HOPPER.

Demosthenes. The Origin and Growth of his Policy. By W. JAEGER. Pp. x + 273. (Cambridge, 1938.) 10s. 6d.

The lectures delivered in 1934 by Professor Jaeger as Sather Professor in the University of California are here published with the addition of an appendix on Isocrates' *Plataicus*, well-documented notes and indexes; the whole has been excellently translated from the German by E. S. Robinson, who is to be congratulated on preserving the charm of the original. As Professor Jaeger warns us, the aim of the lectures is to provide not a biography of Demosthenes nor a reconstruction of historical events, but 'a reinterpretation of his orations as the documents of his political thought and action.' It is true that much biography and much history are included, but the whole is orientated towards understanding the mind and the ideas of Demosthenes; for this reason the formative period of his career is more intensively studied—that is, down to the fall of Olynthus—while the period after the battle of Chaeronea is but briefly summarised.

The first three chapters supply the background to Demosthenes' entry into Athenian politics. The sketch of Athenian history from 404 B.C. to 371 B.C. is particularly interesting, in that the early dialogues of Plato are employed to show the widening gap between intellectual and political life, which led Plato (and later Demosthenes) to urge the need for active citizenship: within the same period the writings of Isocrates reveal a recovery of Athenian morale and a stronger sense of political morality in inter-state politics. Thus Demosthenes' youth was set in a period when higher conceptions of the Polis were stirring in men's minds, and when the success of the Second Athenian Confederacy seemed to justify hopes of a better future; the faith of this period carried Demosthenes through the tragedies of the next decades. The chapter dealing with Demosthenes' youth and career as a logographer is notable for its study of the dramatic, humorous and irresponsible aspects of logography. In 'the Turn to Politics' Professor Jaeger argues that the speeches *against Androtion*, *Timocrates* and *Leptines* are inspired by an opposition party in Athenian politics, whose influence is also reflected in Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* (dated by Jaeger to before the Social War) and *De Pace* and in the *Poroi* (which Jaeger considers is not written by Xenophon); at this stage, then,

in his career Demosthenes is of the well-to-do party of which Eubulus was a prominent member. In the speech *against Leptines* Demosthenes portrays himself as he would have himself be, or be believed to be, at this time—namely, a well-to-do Athenian of moderate views. In his first public speech, *On the Symmories*, Demosthenes, it is argued, represents the same opposition party and the same class.

After this excellent and stimulating introduction, Professor Jaeger turns to the political speeches of Demosthenes. The analysis of his policy which follows is important in its originality and in its method of approach; but the scope of these lectures does not permit a full study even within this limited period of what must be a controversial and delicate problem. For instance, the part played by Demosthenes in the negotiations which culminated in the Peace of Philocrates receives little consideration; but some such study is needed before we can accept such statements as 'Demosthenes refused to assent to the peace (of Philocrates)' and 'Demosthenes believed firmly in this caricature (of Aeschines in the *Paraprosbeia*).' Again, we read (p. 114) that 'Demosthenes early recognised in Philip the most dangerous foe of Athens,' in fact after his advance to Thermopylae, which Jaeger dates to 353 B.C. (early summer); if so, why did Demosthenes preach a policy of intervention in the Peloponnese (against Sparta and Thebes, not against Philip) and in Rhodes (against the Great King, not against Philip) in the speeches *for the Megalopolitans* and *for the Rhodians*, both of which are dated by Jaeger to after 353 B.C. summer? Indeed, if we read those two speeches together with the speech against Aristocrates and, on the other hand, consider the Athenian actions taken against Philip before the date of the First Philippic (dated by Jaeger to about 350 B.C.), where we find Demosthenes for the first time declaring Philip to be a menace, we must conclude that Demosthenes deliberately overlooked (for, as Jaeger says, he cannot have failed to realise) the early advances of Philip and that Eubulus and the party in political control did from an early date oppose Philip by sending relief-forces to help Potidaea, Methone and Pagasae, by making a pact with Cersobleptes, by assisting Onomarchus and by holding the pass of Thermopylae. The danger to which a special study of Demosthenes is exposed, is that history is seen through the speeches of Demosthenes: to this danger I think Professor Jaeger has succumbed, for we find as little mention here as in the *De Corona* of Eubulus' success at Ther-

mopylae of the great effort in Euboea and in Chalcidice (the *πανδημεί* citizen force and 10,000 mercenaries with fifty ships, Dem. xix, 266), and of the Government's skill in averting the dangers inherent in the situation of 346 B.C. It seems to me essential that the full sequence of events should be studied (as they are in Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes*) before judgment is passed on the nature and the growth of Demosthenes' policy.

In conclusion these lectures, as lectures, are to be warmly commended: they are lively, stimulating and original. If Professor Jaeger intends to treat this subject at greater length, it is to be hoped that he will enlarge upon his theory of what Demosthenes means by *τύχη* and *καίρὸς* and that he will relate the speeches of Demosthenes more fully to the historical situations in which alone they have life and significance.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

Institutions des Séleucides. By E. BIKERMAN. 'Haut-commissariat de la république française en Syrie et au Liban, Service des Antiquités—Bibliothèque archéologique et historique. Tome XXVI'. Pp. 268. Paris, 1938. 120 frs.

The Seleucids have in modern times enjoyed a better press than the other Hellenistic dynasties. It may, however, be questioned whether they do not owe their good repute less to their known achievements than to the golden haze of uncertainty with which they are enshrouded. We know too much of the sordid details of the Ptolemaic régime to form any romantic illusions about it. This sober, scholarly and carefully documented book gives us the hard facts, unfortunately few, about the Seleucid kingdom.

M. Bikerman is thoroughly familiar with his subject. He has industriously gathered together every scrap of evidence available not only from the inscriptions, parchments, papyri, seals, coins and cuneiform tablets, but also from a large range of ancient authors. He has studied every document with care and acumen, and in drawing his general conclusion he shows great independence of judgment. He accepts no popular modern doctrine which does not stand up to his rigid canons of evidence. Thus he effectively ridicules the notions that the army, as representing the Macedonian people, had some constitutional right of creating or confirming the kings, and that the deification of the kings had any constitutional effect on their relations with the cities. He refrains in many cases from attempting generalisations when the data are inadequate:

he makes no attempt, for instance, to construct a scheme of satrapies and strategiae, but contents himself with giving a list of the attested cases of either title. He wisely insists on the fluidity of Hellenistic administrative terminology, which to some extent reflects a corresponding fluidity in the administrative system.

On the other hand, M. Bikerman is too prone to draw far-reaching conclusions from dogmatically asserted principles of constitutional law. On p. 76 for instance, he asserts: 'L'idée de souveraineté de la "polis" excluait l'application de la conscription à ses citoyens. La ville envoyait, le cas échéant, un corps d'auxiliaires, mais ne donnait guère les recrues enrôlées individuellement et disséminées en divers corps,' and draws therefrom the conclusion: 'Les Macédoniens, devenus bourgeois d'une cité, étaient perdus pour l'armée royale, au moins pour la phalange.' In Egypt at any rate cleruchs were enrolled as citizens of Alexandria without apparently losing their personal obligation to serve in the various regiments to which they belonged. And are we to believe that the various categories of soldiers to which Smyrna gave her citizenship (*OGI* 229) were lost to the royal army? In his whole treatment of the problem of military colonies, M. Bikerman is more ingenious than convincing. His theory is in effect that there were none in the Seleucid kingdom, but that the Macedonians were planted in civil settlements, which were not cities and were therefore liable to conscription. He denies in particular that there is any evidence for the grant of allotments on condition of military service. In defence of his theory he is obliged to put a very strained interpretation on *OGI* 211, τῶν ἐν Θυατείροις Μακεδόνων οἱ ἡγεμόνες καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται. This he takes to prove that the officers and men were a part only of the Macedonians in Thyateira, soldiers raised from a civil settlement: would he give a similar interpretation to Ἀθηναίων ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος? More serious, he ignores, by removing it to an appendix, *OGI* 229. The interpretation of that inscription is notoriously difficult, but it does show that settlers of some kind (for κάτοικοι, whatever the precise meaning of the term, must mean settlers) were organised on a military basis. The evidence thus suggests that in Asia Minor bodies of troops were settled on the land and retained their military organisation after settlement. The Seleucid system here seems in fact to have been not unlike the Ptolemaic except that the men were planted in corps and not scattered in different villages. That the Seleucid lot like the Ptolemaic carried the obligation of service is not perhaps

susceptible of absolute proof, but it is difficult to see what other interpretation can be put on the ἱππικοί κληροί of *OGI* 229. The only piece of evidence which M. Bikerman offers against this view is that a Μακεδὼν Ὑρκάνιος was practising medicine in Greece in the early years of the second century B.C. But if the obligation to serve was incumbent on the holder of a lot, there must have been many descendants of the original settlers who, being lotless, were therefore free to take up any profession they chose.

On finance also M. Bikerman is also too rigidly dogmatic. Having defined φόρος as an annual block-payment made by the community to the crown, he deduces from the many references to φόρος that such an impost was universally levied (except where immunity was specially granted), and that all other taxes were supplementary to it. This conclusion is startling. Did, for instance, Tralles pay a tribute of say two or three hundred talents a year (M. Bikerman cites these figures as typical), and in addition did Trallian citizens pay a tithe on their crops, which is attested, not to speak of other taxes commonly levied, such as a sales or a poll tax? If so it is curious that Rhodes, whose total revenue from Caunus and Stratonicea was 120 talents, was esteemed a harder taskmaster than Antiochus. The fact surely is that φόρος may sometimes bear the meaning which M. Bikerman gives to it, but can also more generally denote royal taxation of any kind, and that a fixed tribute or specific taxes were normally alternatives and did not coexist. M. Bikerman relies principally for his thesis on the Books of Maccabees, which record a number of specific taxes, some very severe, and also mention block-payments made by various highpriests to the crown. But the block payments are nowhere called φόρος and it is nowhere stated that they were annual (Sulpicius Severus is hardly a reliable witness on this point). In point of fact the payments in *II Macc.*, iv. 8 and 24 seem to be fees or bribes for installation as high priest, those in *I Macc.*, xi, 28, *Jos. Ant.*, XIII, 247 lump sums in amortisation of future taxation.

In his chapter on the organisation of the kingdom M. Bikerman perhaps over-simplifies the relation of the king to the cities of the συμμαχία; in his anxiety to disprove that they were in any sense allies he explains the very term συμμαχία as meaning the part of the kingdom which was not liable to conscription but sent auxiliary contingents (σύμμαχοι). But, despite his tendency to allow a dogma to override his good sense, M. Bikerman has written a book which is always

stimulating and often convincing and by the clarity of his argument and the precision of his documentation he makes it easy for his readers to criticise and if necessary correct his views.

There are one or two misprints in the references, *e.g.*, on p. 108, note 1, read *I Macc.*, 13, 15 for 13, 65. On p. 107 there is a very odd slip; whatever the obscurity of *Jos. Ant.*, xiv, 206, no one has ever suggested that Hyrcanas II paid tribute "en titre de maître de la ville de Sidon."

A. H. M. JONES.

Archaische Vasenornamentik in Attika, Lakonien und Ostgriechenland. By ERNST HOMANN-WEDEKING. Pp. 78, 14 figures. Athens: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1938.

Dr. Wedeking's aim is to arrange on the basis of ornament the archaic vases of Athens, Laconia and East Greece. In Attica, where the chronology is well enough established, he is content to trace the development of two major ornaments, the lotus-palmette and the meander. If not wholly original, this section is sound and clear, and shows a considerable appreciation of Attic vase-painting. One may perhaps cavil at some of the detailed conclusions; for is subsidiary ornament by itself a safe guide to dating within ten years? Incidentally, after the Vari find Payne readjusted his chronology of the early Attic b.f. style 'VC 344' and put back the date of the Nessos vase, for instance, to about 625.

For Laconian Dr. Wedeking is more concerned to establish a sixth-century chronology, using the scanty external clues and the evolution of the handle palmettes of the cups. Generally his conclusions are similar to those of Lane, whose much fuller treatment (*BSA* xxxiv, 99 ff.) was not published till this thesis had been written. On the whole Dr. Wedeking places too much faith in the regular development of ornament and too little in the style of figure-drawing. The criticism in the second appendix of Lane's limit for the end of the Laconian tradition is perhaps sound, but it must be supported by more valid evidence than we yet possess. The fact that Samos K 1428 came from a deposit where there was nothing that must be dated before the last quarter of the sixth century is no proof that it belongs to about 500 (p. 13: section 4. end.).

The section on East Greek is far more debatable, and in our present ignorance of East Greek art requires closer examination here. For his

chronology (pp. 11 ff.) Dr. Wedeking relies on Naucratis and *Clara Rhodos*. Vroulia he dismisses as useless: it should, however, be noted that Kinch based his opinion that most of the graves contained several burials on no more positive evidence than the depth of the charred deposit (*Vroulia*, 55), and secondly that there is no obvious difference in time between the objects found in any one grave. Naucratis, it is assumed, was reorganised by Amasis about 570, and the mass of the East Greek finds is of later date: this false premise has dire consequences. From *Clara Rhodos* is selected a convenient list of grave groups. But however sound Dr. Wedeking's general theory, the application is less good. An extreme example is the oinochoe *Cl. Rh.* iii, fig. 67: since it belongs to a grave group of the first third of the sixth century (p. 14), it is to be dated about 570-60 (p. 17: group R, no. 4). Dr. Wedeking tackles East Greek class by class. Rhodian: the argument is obscure, but apparently the evolution of the lotus flower is his guiding light, and other criteria are ignored. In fact his group Q may well be earlier than group P, and is certainly earlier than the Sakkara amphora. Rhodian Fikellura is dated after 550 on its absence (in 1934) from earlier graves: the lack of relevant graves is not mentioned. Again the development of ornament is overstressed, and thus all vases with a single figure between handle volutes, and perhaps the Altenburg amphora, join the Dionysus amphoriskos (*Cl. Rh.* iv, fig. 267) at the end of the sixth century (p. 17, bottom: for earlier dates of some of these vases see *BSA* xxxiv, 1 ff.). Samian: Dr. Wedeking is at an advantage, since little of the available material is yet published. He attacks the application of the term Fikellura to Samian work, which is finer and more versatile — 'Ausdruck "polykratischen Stils," nur auf Samos und nur damals möglich.' 'Naucratis': inscriptions painted before firing prove that a style distinct from Chiot developed not long before 570 (Amasis again); the polychrome figure style is replaced about 550 by the b.f. 'Comast style,' and the 'Pyxis Animal style' belongs to the third quarter. But the fundamental date 570 is not safe (see *JHS* 1937, 227 ff.); the similarity of Naucratis and Chiot clay remains unexplained; and do painted inscriptions on 'Naucratis' at Aegina demand a factory there too? Melian: the evidence against a considerable extension into the sixth century would be interesting. Caeretan: these hydriai, which show the return to naturalistic ornament in the last third of the sixth century, are divided between two masters, neither of

whom was willing to poach the other's belly-ornaments; Webster's account (*JHS* 1928, 196 ff.) is still, however, more cogent. Clazomenian sarcophagi: some good parallels are made, but, even so, such parallels can fix only the upper limit of the date of these sarcophagi.

Dr. Wedeking tries to cover too much ground in too short a space. As a result he rarely gives adequate evidence, and sometimes none, for his chronological theories: this is particularly gross in his treatment of East Greek. Nor does he develop his argument clearly. One suspects that this may be due to haste, though the four years between composition and publication should have allowed him time to master the old material better and to take more notice of the new. He is also too rigid in his assumption that ornaments evolve with absolute regularity. To sum up, the section on East Greek is (in the opinion of this reviewer, who may well be prejudiced) worthless: the section on Laconian should be noted for its criticisms of Lane: the section on Attic is instructive, but it would have been better to have expanded it and provided drawings to illustrate the development of the various ornaments. This lack of illustrations is a serious fault, for most scholars boggle at continuously looking up references, and with a little care the number of works required could have been considerably reduced. Although one is grateful for the excellent reproductions of unpublished pieces, it would have eased the digestion of this article, and cost no more, to have given us typical examples for the evolution of the main ornaments. Finally, Dr. Wedeking's literary style is lucid and easy for foreigners to read.

R. M. COOK.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: United States of America 6 = The Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md, 2. By D. M. ROBINSON, with the assistance of S. E. FREEMAN. Pp. 38: 57 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

This volume contains more than would appear from the title-page: for the best vases are the property of the Baltimore Society of the Archaeological Institute of America and are lent to the Robinson collection: while one vase, belonging to another collector, is on loan in the Museum of Arts. The Robinson collection proper includes good pieces and interesting subjects. Some of the vases, in this fascicule as in the last, are rather more freely restored than one expects in a modern collection, and these might be

republished, with the false omitted, in a later instalment.

Pl. 1, 1: pine-branch rather than olive? Pl. 1, 3: Kraiker's observations are misunderstood; and the rule about the relation of picture to handle is not stated accurately, for the vertical axis of the inside picture is seldom at right angles to the handles: place it so, and the poise is wrong, as in plates 3, 10, and 15. Pl. 4: Hartwig pl. 18, 3 is now in Leipsic. Pl. 5: the inscription inside is given wrong; and the girl on B can hardly have held a thyrsus: she does in the restoration published by Hartwig, but the thyrsus-head was marked as modern, and the photograph shows no trace even of a staff: the reference to *Campana Fragments* has evidently got out of place. Pl. 10: the cap is of oriental type and is not the Thracian ἀλωπτεκῆ: the vase is not, I think, 'in the manner of Onesimos': it is later, and may be placed, roughly speaking, in the neighbourhood of such cups as pls. 19 and 21. Pl. 11: the charge, as Hartwig saw, is the head of a κῆτος: the first rho has a tail like the second. Pl. 12: Minto's view that the man is Hermes is made very probable by the caduceus he holds in the other two pictures of the same subject, on the Brygan cup in Florence (*Mon. Ant.* 30, p. 686) and the lekythos in Tübingen: it is a lost story: Hermes invented the top as he invented lyre and pan-pipes: the whip he had from Apollo (*Hymn to Hermes* 497). Pl. 13: the phrase 'pleated chiton' used here and elsewhere is surely misleading. Pl. 15: can the 'indeterminate objects' held by the left-hand maenad on B be short torches? Hartwig's drawing shows what might be flames above them, but the authors make no reference to this. Pl. 17: the thing on A is a reticule, but would not be very suitable for containing nuts or knuckle-bones: balls, or onions (*Ar. Ach.* 550), yes. Pl. 19-20 is stated, like many of the Robinson vases, to have been found in a cemetery near Vari in Attica: but I do not know if that is reconcileable with its having been no. 186 in the Heseltine collection, sold at Christie's on April 19th, 1921. Similarly pl. 29, 2, also said to be from Vari, was no. 71 in the Vernon collection, sold at Sotheby's on December 16th, 1926, and is figured on pl. 3 of the sale catalogue: it may be from Cumae (see the preface to *CV* Oxford, ii). Pl. 21, 2 is by Onesimos himself. Pl. 23, 2: the b.f. plate in the manner of Lydos, with Apollo and Herakles struggling for the Fawn, is not in Amsterdam, but in Oxford. Pl. 27: Buschor's list is not of 'scenes from the Eleusinian mysteries,' but of pictures of Triptolemos. Pl. 29, 1: lid as well as handles are

alien: the foot seems alien if not modern: the head of Silenos is modern, and great part of the whole figure; the reverse is repainted. Pl. 29, 2: for the history of the vase see above on pl. 19. The foot of the vase is modern. The god is Dionysos rather than Zeus. Pl. 31: the thing in Theseus' hand is hard to explain: a jewel-box is a desperate suggestion: when you give a ring, you put it on the finger and there it stays. Pl. 31, at the end: the second dolphin-riding would not belong to the chief picture, but would be one of those repeats which Miss Haspels has shown to be almost a feature of later b.f. lekythoi (*ABL* pp. 151, 99 and 139): as to the satyr, he would come from a satyr-play: for satyrs taking part in the adventures of Theseus, see the cups Florence V. 58 and Tartu 105 (Malmberg and Felsburg pl. 5). The satyr has nothing to do with the story of Arion. The animal in pl. 38, 1 is a donkey: I do not find the Altamura painter here, but the reproductions are rather small. Pl. 38, 2 has no connection with the Achilles Painter: compare a lekythos in the University of Cracow (*CV*, pl. 10, Poland 83, 2: both recall the Klugmann Painter. Pl. 38, 3 is a pleasing little picture, aptly called 'Dick Whittington' by its former owner. Part of the traveller's luggage is a *κοτυλίσκιον* (Ar. *Ach.* 459), a portable drinking-mug: cf. the Tübingen skyphos F 2 (Watzinger, pl. 41), or the Boeotian pyxis in London, E 814 (C. Smith *BM Cat.* iii, pl. 21). I see no special resemblance to the Oxford mug *CV*, pl. 62, 3. Pl. 39 has already been figured on pl. 6 of Sotheby's catalogue for 14th March, 1929, and without the present restorations, so that the new publication does not supersede the old. The vase is assigned to the Splanchnopt Painter in *Campana Fragments*, p. 24 on pl. 16 B 29. Pl. 43: there is nothing Thracian, I fancy, in the sleeved garment, or servile in the borders; the Villa Albani relief is not sixth century. Pl. 45: the inscription Tithonos on the Leningrad pelike is generally taken to be a slip of the painter's, and it does not justify the title 'Eos with Kephalos and Tithonos.' In pl. 46 the maenad is dancing, not walking. By the same hand as this vase, the Harvard stamnos *CV* Hoppin, pls. 14-15, and the bell-krater Syracuse 22833 (*Mon. Ant.* 14, pl. 51). Pl. 48, 1: the torches would not drip wax, though a candle would: the hydria is surely a prize in itself, not a recipient for prize oil: the artist is not the Kleophon Painter; the third torch-runner is missed—he is on the frontlet of the second. Pl. 48, 2: the goddess has a sceptre and not a spear, so it is doubtful if she can be Athena. I do not find anything of

the Washing Painter in pl. 49, or of the Sabouroff Painter in pl. 50. In pl. 50 the subject of the stand is doubtless Peleus and Thetis, as the dolphin suggests: there is no argument for Apollo or for Daphne.

J. D. B.

Die schwarzfigurigen etruskischen Vasen aus der zweiten Hälfte des sechstens Jahrhunderts. By T. DOHRN. Pp. 164: 9 plates. Berlin: Triltsch and Huther, 1937.

When Ducati published some years ago a study of the most sprightly class of Etruscan black-figure, the 'Pontic vases,' a reviewer in this *Journal* referred to them as 'rather unpleasing,' while Ducati himself condemned the other classes in one devastating phrase 'eine schludrige Duzentware.' The reader will therefore not expect much of general interest from this monograph: among the four hundred vases that it studies there is not one that can be rated higher than second class. The greater therefore the credit which is due to Dr. Dohrn for his self-sacrificing patience in giving us the first complete account of these wares; and we must add that, if his book does not deal with a subject of the highest interest, it has no lack of excitement in detail. What emerges clearly is the extraordinary complexity of the elements which went to form the Etruscan styles—Attic, Caeretan, Chalcidian, Corinthian, Ionian, Laconian details are so inextricably mixed that it is rarely possible to assign any group to any one source.

Broadly speaking, there are three main divisions: the oldest comprises two groups of vases, those of the Ivy and the La Tolfa Painters, whose work begins about mid sixth century. The Pontic vases are next studied and divided up among four painters and an unassigned group: this division cuts across that of Ducati into six groups, although Ducati's first class is incorporated with additions into Dohrn's group of the Paris Painter. Then follow the later fabrics, among whom a very prolific artist, the Siren Painter, is prominent, with some local classes, of no interest save as illustrating the Etruscan conservative adherence to the black-figure technique even when copying red-figure models. Dr. Dohrn bravely attempts to give homes to these groups, but the material is inadequate for success; naturally the coastal towns such as Tarquinia or Caere possess the greater probability. The book is not well arranged, and some of the best sections in it—e.g., the note on a Laconian-Etruscan group—may be missed on a hasty perusal. But it is a great advance on

all previous treatments of the subject, and Dr. Dohrn has well earned our thanks.

F. N. PRYCE.

Fruhitaliotische Vasen. By A. D. TRENDALL. *Bilder Griechischer Vasen*, edited by J. D. BEAZLEY and P. JACOBSTHAL, part 12. Pp. 44; 32 plates. Leipzig: H. Keller, 1938. Export price, RM 21.

As the title may puzzle the reader who does not happen to be a vase-specialist, it may be well to explain that 'early Italiote vases' are the earliest vases of the red-figure style made in the Greek cities of Southern Italy. There are other Italian red-figured fabrics: a Campanian group of vases is as old, some Etruscan imitations of red-figure are earlier: but these are the work of 'barbarians,' whereas the Italiote vases are Greek, and their appearance has been very plausibly explained by assuming the presence of Attic potters among the colonists of Thurii in 443 B.C. At the outset they can only be distinguished from contemporary Attic products by slight differences, e.g., in the colour of the clay, and their stylistic divergence from Attic into something definitely Italic is a gradual process.

Furtwangler was the first to detect the existence of this ceramic province, and to him we also owe the suggestion of Thurii. But the work of surveying and mapping has been the work of English scholars. Tillyard and Beazley were the pioneers, then followed an invaluable paper in *BSR* XI, in which Miss Moon collated all previous results and carried us much further into unexplored territory. After her work the main outlines of the map were settled. But there was still need of the detailed and systematic survey which Mr. Trendall now gives us, in which nearly four hundred vases are set out in order and distributed among some fourteen artists. Future discoveries will no doubt bring additions to his lists, but are not likely to modify his arrangement.

There are two main groups, the first comprising 261 vases and four prolific artists: the Pisticii Painter, who may well be an Athenian, so near is his earliest work to Attic r. f. of 450-40; then the Amykos Painter, who already begins to show a native independence (though Mr. Trendall leaves open the possibility that he is but the latest phase of the Pisticii artist). Towards the end of the fifth century two other painter appear, the Kreusa Painter (from whom though Mr. Trendall has taken the Louvre Kreusa vase), and the Dolon Painter, so called from the masterpiece of the group, the Dolon krater in the British Museum, whom Mr. Trendall credits

with another famous vase, the Tiresias krater in the Cabinet des Médailles, thus reverting to the older view of Hauser. With these the greatness of this school departs, and its successors are the very inferior 'Lucanian' vases.

The home of this group of artists is not known: Mr. Trendall argues for a Lucanian centre, perhaps Herakleia. The evidence of provenience speaks strongly for such a location, which, however, leaves one point unexplained—the use by these painters of that curious vase-form, the *nestoris*, which is plainly the *trozzella* of the local Messapian style and which seems to point away from Lucania to the extreme south of Apulia. Messapian pottery to the best of our knowledge did not penetrate into Lucania: but it is difficult to imagine Greek potters adopting this ungainly native shape for some of their most ambitious efforts unless they found it in everyday use around them.

The second group, smaller numerically but more monumental in its art, is of greater importance, for it is the opening stage of the long series we call 'Apulian.' That its home was Tarentum has long been suspected, and is now placed almost beyond doubt by the finding of unfinished fragments in recent excavation. It begins with two excellent artists, the painter of the vivacious 'dancing-girl' krater in Berlin, and the still better painter of the big volute krater in Munich representing the marriage of Sisypheos. Two minor artists and an isolated masterpiece, the Karneia vase from Ceglie, are associated with these, then the Tarporley Painter and some pupils form a second stage, extending into the fourth century, whilst the last two artists, the Sarpedon and the Birth of Dionysos Painters, lead on to the developed Apulian style.

This is a most welcome addition to the rapidly-growing *Bilder* series. It not only provides us with a guide to an important and little-understood family of vases, but it is a necessary preliminary chapter to the complete history of South Italian vase-painting which we hope Mr. Trendall will shortly give us.

F. N. PRYCE.

Monumenti della pittura antica scoperti in Italia. Sezione prima: La pittura etrusca. Tarquinia, fasc. I; Le pitture delle Tombe delle Leonesse e dei Vasi Dipinti. By P. DUCATI. Pp. 22, with 23 text illustrations: 6 plates and three coloured plates. Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1937. 180 l.

A year has passed since the first fascicules of the great enterprise undertaken some eleven

years ago by the Istituto Italiano di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte were welcomed in this *Journal* (lvii, 269). The appearance of the first fascicule of the first section, which is to deal with Etruscan tomb-paintings, calls for an even warmer welcome. Comparisons are odious, but the majority of us will probably agree that Etruscan frescoes are more urgently in need of record and publication than paintings of the Graeco-Roman schools: for, without entering into the question of intrinsic artistic merit, it must be admitted that they are much rarer; while time and weather are proving as destructive to them as to the works of the later period. If we take Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti and compare Ducati's photographs on pl. V with Gatti's water-colours made in 1912 on pl. VI and with Schultz's drawings of 1870 as published by Helbig in *MI* X, after all allowance is made for the different methods of reproduction, there remains evidence of woeful decay; the whole left side of the main banqueting scene has largely become an unintelligible blur since 1912. Tomba delle Leonesse has the same tale to tell when Ducati's illustrations are set against Korte's of 1889-1901 in *AD* II. We should like to express the hope, now a beginning has been made with the Etruscan section, that progress on it will be as rapid and continuous as possible. The material is not too extensive, and a few years of steady work would suffice to cover the whole field and give us a complete record of the extant remains.

The two tombs which Prof. Ducati has selected as the subject of his opening fascicule make an instructive pair. Both are of much the same size, and the subjects of the frescoes are similar: dancing figures and banquets; in Tomba delle Leonesse the dancers occupy the place of honour at the back with the banqueters on either flank, while in Vasi Dipinti the emphasis is laid on the banquet-scene. Nor is the actual interval of time between them likely to be great, yet in style there is a marked difference. Tomba delle Leonesse shows still Ionic elegance, Vasi Dipinti, with its stocky, more muscular figures, betrays new influences; Ducati aptly cites the contrast between the Caeretan sarcophagus in the Villa Giulia and the Apollo of Veii. In his dating he reacts from the low chronology proposed by Messerschmidt; Tomba dei Tori at the head of the Tarquinian series is replaced in the middle of the sixth century, Tomba delle Leonesse is set near 530, Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti nearer 520 than 510.

The tiny hermaphrodite on the side wall of Tomba delle Leonesse remains a mystery;

Ducati sees in it a statuette. From the drawing on figure 20, it seems that the object held in the right hand is not a ring, but something with a stalk. And there still seems much to be said for the old view that the banqueter on coloured plate B is holding an egg.

A word of praise must be given to the admirable plates which fully maintain the high standard set by the earlier fascicules. The inclusion among them of Gatti's earlier copies of the Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti was a happy thought, for without them many of the modern photographs would be meaningless. May Professor Ducati soon give us more fascicules of this series.

F. N. PRYCE.

Tarentiner Grabkunst. By HANS KLUMBACH. Pp. xii + 99: 42 plates. Reutlingen, 1937. Export price, RM 24.

The present work gives us a catalogue of the sculptural and architectural limestone fragments from Taranto known to the author: in all he lists 333 pieces, the majority of which he illustrates, often for the first time. The author took as the basis of his research the notes of Prof. Watzinger, made in Taranto and Bari in 1902 and 1910, and these he supplemented by additional material gained as the result of a personal visit to those museums in 1928. It is unfortunate that he was unable to revisit the museum of Taranto between then and the date this book was published, many important pieces having recently come to light, either from new excavations or from the 'magazzini' of the museum. Of outstanding merit is a large pedimental group found in July 1931 in the Via degli Angioini representing the rape of Persephone. Other fragments in the round show an Amazonomachy and the rape of the Leucippidae—a subject very popular on terra-cotta reliefs. From the store-rooms of the museum come several framed reliefs, of better quality than those figured by Klumbach on Pl. 13: of these the most noteworthy show (1) two warriors, one with a helmet, the other with a shield, (2) two women, (3) a striding warrior, (4) a winged figure falling down beside a stele. In addition to these are also numerous architectural fragments, including several good triglyph-metope friezes. Other relevant material from recent excavations in Taranto will be found in a long article by Bartoccini (*NSc*, 1936, pp. 107-232; a summary by Wullemier in *RA*, 1938, i, pp. 77-9), who is himself preparing a corpus of the figured capitals from Taranto. The absence of this new material does not seriously affect Klumbach's conclusions, but it is to be hoped that he will

be able soon to revisit Taranto and publish the new fragments with his views upon them.

After the catalogue follow two explanatory chapters, one on the sculpture, the other on the architecture. The sculptural fragments are classified according to their subjects, which show a fairly wide range—battle, Dionysiac and mythological scenes predominating. An attempt is then made to arrange them according to style; two groups are related to Scopas and Timotheos respectively, and dated to the third quarter of the fourth century; a third, that of the flying drapery (*Flatterstil*), is put slightly later to the last decades of the fourth century or the early years of the third. The dating is supported by the external evidence of vases, marble sculpture and terra-cottas, though perhaps not enough stress is laid upon the last and a little too much on the first of these. It is, however, rather risky to venture on such close stylistic ascriptions: the general influence of the prevailing Greek styles in sculpture is certainly visible (that of Scopas, for instance, in several of the heads, notably no. 17; that of the artists of the Mausoleum frieze in nos. 13 and 14; while the New York relief (no. 44, Pl. 9) has strong affinities with the sculptured column-base from Ephesus in the B.M.) and doubtless the visit of Lysippus to Taranto, where he made a colossal bronze statue of Herakles, was not without its effects upon the local artists, but to classify their works in accordance with the Greek schools is going a little far, especially as so much of the material is in such a poor state of preservation. The relief no. 36, for example, is hardly sufficient evidence on which to base a series of attributions to the style of Timotheos.

The architectural fragments are well arranged and analysed. Particular attention is paid to naiskoi, of which we have so many examples on South Italian vases, though a few diagrams or sketches here would have helped to make the author's suggested reconstructions a little clearer. The book as a whole is carefully produced and the plates clear, though some photographs show traces of trimming round the edges. Misprints are very rare—the Ruvo amphora with Nereids on p. 63 should be no. 425 and not 24, and throughout volute-kraters are referred to as *Amphoren*, which is apt to be rather misleading at times. The short hair of the mourning Electra on the relief no. 61 (p. 63) is well paralleled on the Boston Orestes amphora (Jacobsthal, *Die Melischen Reliefs*, p. 169, fig. 50); Orestes with the hydria (no. 63, p. 64) appears again on a bell-krater in Vienna (689; Laborde, i, 8).

The rich material now placed before us serves

to confirm the view that in the fourth century Taranto was the cultural and artistic centre of South Italy, and Dr. Klumbach is to be warmly congratulated on a work that will be of the greatest value to all students of Italiote history and art.

A. D. TRENDALL.

Arte e Civiltà della Sicilia Antica: II, Arte Ingegneria e Artigianato. By BIAGIO PACE. Pp. vii + 528; 7 pl., 371 text figures. Soc. Dante Alighieri, 1938. 50 l.

The second volume of what seems likely to be a most voluminous work on ancient Sicily¹ largely covers the same ground as the author's *Arte ed Artisti della Sicilia Antica*, which it is intended to supersede. There is no topic of importance which had not been handled in the earlier work, none which is not more fully dealt with in this.² Senator Pace's general position is the same as in 1915, but the quantity of new material discovered since, and the wider scope and more reasoned outlook of the new book, make the re-statement of his views very welcome. All students of ancient Sicily, archaeologists or historians, will be glad to have in one volume so well illustrated the material remains of Sicilian art and craftsmanship.

In general, many scholars will disagree with Pace's estimate of the originality and value of the Sicilian contribution to Greek art. It is worth examining his thesis of Sicilian originality in three categories, architecture, sculpture, vase-painting. He makes, with a disarming admission of the danger of being influenced by patriotism (p. 219), the suggestion that the origins of Doric architecture in stone may well be sought in Sicily. He opposes Orsi's view that many sixth-century Sicilian temples were wooden: this point, on which I think the excavator to be right, is not very relevant to the question of origins, for wood was used in the stoneless parts of both Greece and Sicily long after the first big stone temples had been built. The view that the early features in sixth-century Sicilian temples are due not to innovations but to provincial conservatism rests on no preconceived notion of the nature of the colonies, but on some hard facts of relative chronology. Pace dates the Heraeum at Olympia and the temple of Apollo at Thermon in the sixth century, the temple of Artemis at Corfu not far from the middle of the sixth century, and the temple of

¹ For the first see *JHS* 1936. 242.

² The most useful part of *Arte ed Artisti* not absorbed into the new book is Appendix III (referred to on p. 61, n. 2).

Apollo at Corinth before 582: dates which need to be debated, not postulated, before they can be opposed to the late seventh-century dates proposed for the Apollonion and Olympieion at Syracuse and Temple C at Selinus. It would be difficult to find a page more full of feeble chronological arguments than p. 217. Accepting the usual date c. 570 for C, the period of development at Selinus which precedes it is still remarkable, both in output and progress made, and provides a very full half-century. Moreover an early date for the little buildings at Selinus which precede C involves the conclusion, from which Pace does not shrink, that the little buildings of the same sort at Akragas are to be dated in the seventh century or the beginning of the sixth: that is, that before the foundation of the colony there were nine or ten little sanctuaries already founded inside the area later enclosed by the walls. One is possible, the odd building explored by Marconi (figs. 177-9): more are surely improbable. If priority must be given up, the question whether there are elements peculiar to Western Doric still deserves careful consideration: the case would be strengthened by a detailed examination of the South Italian temples as well as the Sicilian.

The same criticism may be made of Pace's treatment of sculpture. The dating of the metopes of temple C so early as 560 B.C. is untenable,¹ and with it falls to the ground the whole view of their artists as innovators. Here, again, we may hope for a truer appreciation of their place in the history of Greek sculpture when a comparison with the Paestum metopes is possible. Pace gives a reasonable answer to the extreme view that all the marble sculpture found in Sicily was imported across the Ionian sea: but goes too far in the other direction. The Grammichele torso and the Lentini torso, at least, must be imports. To the latter probably belongs, as Libertini suggests, the head in Catania, *Museo Biscari* pl. 1-2: Pace surprisingly does not mention it: the whole figure is, to my mind, the best piece of archaic sculpture found in Sicily. The fine little draped torso from Selinus (*Mon. Ant.* 32, pl. 25), might also have found a place.

It is a curious but well-established fact that of all the quantity of Greek painted pottery found in Sicily, none can confidently be said

to have been made there. Those who hold the contrary view appear to be moved, rather than by the methodical study of material from Sicily and elsewhere which alone can give any measure of certainty, by arguments of two sorts: (1) the *a priori* likelihood that vases found in Sicily will have been made there; and (2) if painted pottery was made in most parts of Greece in the geometric and orientaling periods, and later in South Italy, why not then also in Sicily? Neither of these arguments from probability can stand for a moment when vases either by the same hand, or of exactly the same style and school as those found in Sicily, are shown to have been made elsewhere. Examining the groups of vases which have been thought to be Sicilian, we find first a group at Gela, some of which are certainly Cretan, while others may possibly be local imitations. Next, a group at Syracuse, the so-called Fusco craters, of which Arias has recently shown some to be Argive, others Cycladic (*BCH* 1936, 144 ff.). Pace repeats the old view, generally abandoned since the definitive study of the Protocorinthian and Corinthian fabrics, that much of the pottery of those styles found in Sicily is of Sicilian manufacture. This would be more convincing if he could either quote individual pieces which are Sicilian, or give a criterion by which Sicilian products could be distinguished from Corinthian. In the absence of such a criterion, or rather, in face of the fact that indistinguishable vases are found in Corinth, in many other parts of Greece and in the islands, and in Sicily, and are moreover proved by the finds of the Corinthian Ceramicus to be made in Corinth, it is time that this view was given up. It is noteworthy that Pace can find no literature less than forty years old to quote in its favour.

Pace also repeats his attribution to Sicily of a number of Attic and South Italian red-figured vases (unfortunately with the twice repeated misprint on pp. 464-5 which refers the beginning of South Italian vase-painting to the end of the fourth century). Of his so-called Sicilian vases: 1-4 are Paestan; Trendall's arguments are more convincing than Pace's assertion that they are Syracusan, since he disregards the other vases by the same painter. 5 and 6 are Attic; 7 is Early South Italian; 8-10 are Apulian. The Lipari group is shown by the reverse of the tunny-selling crater to be Campanian. The horrid things in figs. 344-8 are Apulian or Campanian. On the phlyax vases, we wait for Trendall's forthcoming work: in the meantime, it is useless to quote the Syracusan origin of Rhinthon as an argument that they are Sicilian, for his

¹ Pace says p. 18 that all agree on the date 560 B.C. It may be worth quoting some dissident opinions: Ashmole, after 550 *Greek Sculpture in Sicily and S. Italy*, p. 26, n. 4.; Richter, c. 550-40 *Greek Sculpture and Sculptors*, pp. 29, 96.; Langlotz, 520-10 *Zeitbestimmung*, p. 37.; Marconi, beginning of the sixth century *L'Ingrinto*, p. 194.

floruit is about a century later than that of the phryx vases: and one may point out that they are assigned to various South Italian fabrics, not on grounds of provenience, but on points of agreement of style with vases known to belong to these fabrics. So we are reduced to Centuripe and the third century before we can be certain of any group of vases made in Sicily.

Considering that coins are among the most important remains of Sicilian art, and that moreover a good case may be made out for supposing the Sicilian coiners to have been innovators whose example was followed in Greece, it is a pity that there is not a full discussion of the value of the coins as works of art, and of connected problems; for instance, the origins and relations of the coiners of the late archaic period, and of the masters who sign. More might also be made of the method of comparison between coins and sculpture, recognised long since by Pace himself, and recently developed by Ashmole. A minor point is that we miss many of the representations of statues on coins, illustrated in *Arte ed Artisti*, figs. 44-5, 49-52. We should gladly have had, too, a discussion of the question what bronzes, if any, were made in Sicily. Indeed, this chapter IV of book V, a reprint with few revisions of the corresponding section of *Arte ed Artisti*, is jejune and unsatisfactory. But it is too much to expect an equal treatment of the whole field of ancient art.

I have already mentioned the illustrations, and am particularly grateful for the photographs of the new wooden statues from Palma Montechiaro (figs. 9-10), the new Phoenician statue from Motye (fig. 112), the Mistretta fragment (fig. 108), the agreeable fishing scene on the mosaic from Termini (fig. 174), the detail of the most unattractive Zeus from Solunto (fig. 129), and the technical account of this statue. It is also valuable to have Basile's architectural drawings reproduced. Many of the well-known objects are better illustrated elsewhere, but we must remember that this is, in the best sense of the word, a popular book. Not the least merit is the price, over 500 pages, 371 figures and 7 coloured plates, for a little over ten shillings.

T. J. DUNBABIN.

Römische Kopien griechischer Skulpturen des iv. Jahrhunderts vor Chr. By CARL BLÜMEL. Pp. 46; 80 plates. Berlin: Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft 1938. RM 36.

Like most of the older European collections of antique sculpture, the Altes Museum in Berlin contains much that has now little interest or

value except as documentation for the history of taste. We have long since ceased to believe that the lost masterpieces of Greek art can be recovered from the garden-ornaments of imperial Rome: and the detective problems which exercised the generation of Furtwangler and Kekule have lost their attraction and their power to stimulate our curiosity. Prof. Blümel has done his best for the Roman copies of fourth-century Greek sculpture: but it cannot be denied that his task has been to collect and classify the opinions of fifty years ago, rather than to contribute new interpretations of today. He has, of course, performed this task with admirable conscientiousness: and this latest volume of the new Berlin catalogue is a model of what such a catalogue should be, if it is to exist at all. But when we reflect upon the riches of the Berlin collections, and their relatively unpublished state, we cannot help wondering whether such a volume as the present one was among the more pressing needs of archaeology.

The most interesting pieces here under review are doubtless the copies of fourth-century portraits. Portraiture was a new art; and even in Roman replicas of moderate intrinsic value we can trace something of the curiosity which the originals must once have provoked. The gradual emergence of the concept of personality can even now be followed, as soon as we can be sure of the chronological order of the individual monuments: and it is precisely in this sphere that recent research has been most active and has achieved its most solid successes. It is now becoming possible to reconstruct with somewhat greater confidence the successive stages in the evolution of the Greek portrait during the fourth century: and to this increase in our knowledge Professor Blümel's catalogue makes an important contribution.

His series begins with two puzzles: K 190 and K 191 are two bearded herms, reproducing types of the first half of the century. B. considers that they formed a pair in antiquity (they were acquired together from the Polignac collection, according to the Berlin tradition), and that they represent two kindred poets or philosophers. K 190 is unique: of K 191 there are replicas in Munich (AB. 363.4) and Copenhagen (*Billedtavler*, pl. 31, no. 434). The copies date from the first century of the empire, are clearly the product of the same workshop, and in quality are decidedly above the average. As the herms are not uniform in shape, B.'s contention that they formed a pair is not entirely convincing (see especially the profile views): but they certainly belong to the same school. The

physiognomic types are contrasted: K 190 represents an active-minded elderly man gazing straight before him into the distance: K 191 a younger, but more romantically bearded, figure, seemingly more introspective and preoccupied. Upon the internal evidence alone, we might say that the former was the more philosophic the latter the more poetic type, without (of course) committing ourselves to the hypothesis that the one is a philosopher and the other a poet. But if the two portraits were really intended as pendants, the antithesis of temperament is doubtless intentional. As for the dating, it is permissible to be a little more precise than Blümel, who merely ascribes them without comment to the first half of the century, in spite of the fact that there is a good deal of difference between the style of 400 and that of 350. The loose and picturesque treatment of the hair and bearded lower portions of the face, especially in K 191, prevents our dating the types too early in the century. On the other hand, the wide spacing of the eyes, their heavy lids, and the shallow setting of the sockets under the brows, are characteristic of the fifth century rather than of the fourth. It seems likely, then, that the artist was one of those classicistic masters of the fourth century, like the elder Kephisodotos, who retained the classical structure of the face while admitting new developments in the accessories. This is probably the explanation of the notorious stylistic inconsistencies in a head like that of the old woman in the British Museum no. 2001: Poulsen (*JdI* xlvii (1932), p. 80) assigns her to a classicising artist of the thirties or twenties of the fourth century: it is possible that the two Berlin heads belong to a similar class, and are later than they appear at first sight, though it is also possible that the classicistic traits are due to the Augustan copyist.

K 192 and K 193: two portraits of Plato, one with an inscribed herm. Blümel maintains that both derive from the same original, probably the statue by Silanion. But can this be so? The proportions of the head and the shape of the beard are entirely different: in K 192 the skull is broad and flat-topped, and the beard consists of a number of vertical ringlets forming a square curtain; whereas in K 193 the head (although damaged and therefore somewhat misleading in its present state) is much more domed, while the beard is softer, longer, and tapering in form, as are, indeed, the proportions of the face as a whole. The prototype of K 192 may well be the statue of Silanion: as for K 193, it seems much more probable that it derives from some 'Socratizing' portrait, perhaps that

which lies behind the extremely poor (but in this respect instructive) double herm of Socrates and Plato K 195. Such a composition would probably be a product of the early third century, like the double herms of Epicurus and Metrodorus (Hekler, *Greek and Roman Portraits*, pl. 100) or Crates and Hipparchia K 206 (cf. Crome in *Ad* 1935, col. 4, figs. 5-7), which Blümel dates shortly after 350, but which must surely be later.

The romantic tradition in fourth-century portraiture, of which a trace can be seen in the hair and beard of K 190 and K 191, perhaps descends from an expressionist master like Scopas. Such a work as the grave-relief from the Ilissos (Conze 1055; Diepolder, pp. 51 f., pl. 48), with its extraordinary intensity of feeling in the physiognomy of the mourning father, shows how early the grandeur and pathos of old age were explored in Greek sculpture: the Olympian elders of fifth-century art are now paralleled by patriarchs of an almost oriental impressiveness. Bald heads with sparse and streaming locks, tangled beards, deep-set eyes beneath jutting brows: all these familiar features are already exploited by the middle of the century. The model for such a head as the Euripides K 197 dates, as Blümel says, from the third quarter of the century: the next stage is exemplified by K 198, which Blümel gives to the same period as the Euripides, but which looks a little later—nearer to early third-century works such as the Strategos K 204, which Blümel compares with the Demosthenes portrait by Polyuctus (c. 280 B.C.).

The Alexander head K 203, a replica of the Athens-Erbach type (AB. 473.6), is now (following the opinion expressed in a still unpublished dissertation by Gebauer) derived from the chryselephantine statue by Leochares erected in the Philippeion at Olympia shortly after Chaeroneia. If this claim can be substantiated, we acquire an important new fixed point in the still regrettably vague chronology of later fourth-century sculpture.

The head of a young woman with a 'melonfrisur' found by Schliemann at Alexandria K 205 is connected with the statue of Corinna by Silanion, on the grounds of its resemblance to a statuette with an inscribed base in the Musée Vivenel at Compiègne. The connexion between this statuette and the work by Silanion, as well as between the Schliemann head and the statuette, must remain questionable. Schmidt's investigations into the art of Silanion (*JdI* xlvii (1932), pp. 239 ff.: xlix. (1934), pp. 180 ff.) have not succeeded in making

the personal style of this master easily recognisable: to have called him 'the first of the classicists' and at the same time to have attributed to him the romantically disordered locks of the Olympia pugilist, as well as the prototypes of the Plato portrait and this head K 205, does not advance our knowledge of mid fourth-century art.

Upon the remaining copies of ideal works a few words must suffice. K 207 Bearded herm: B. calls this an archaistic variant of an original of about 470 B.C., but does not make it clear whether he regards the transformation as due to the Roman artist, or whether he postulates an intervening modulation in the fourth century; it is presumably for this reason that he includes it in the present catalogue (cf., however, Schmidt, *Archaistische Kunst*, pp. 44 f., where no intervening stage seems to be implied). A similar doubt arises in the case of K 208 (head of Ammon): if the original is assigned to the middle of the fifth century (an unexpected judgment in any case), why is it included in the present volume? K 211 and K 212 (Asklepios and Apollo Kitharodos) show interesting eclectic mixtures of style: the former has a late fifth-century head on a body of about 300 B.C.; the latter a head of about 300 B.C. on a late fifth-century body. When were these combinations effected? K 220-1: two replicas of the Resting Satyr; and K 222-4: three further replicas of the head of the same statue. B. prudently doubts the conventional attribution to Praxiteles. K 230: Eros bending his bow; K 231-2: two further replicas of the head; B. accepts the conjecture that the original was an early work of Lysippos. K 236: Head of a young athlete from Capua: B. remarks on the typically Capuan finish, and compares other works from the same source—e.g., the Naples Psyche—which may well be early Augustan imitations of fourth-century work, not direct copies from originals of the period. This very just observation might be extended to so many Roman 'copies' that the whole exercise of inferring the 'original' must be recognised for what it is: namely, an aesthetic rather than a scientific activity. So long as this is remembered, no harm is done. It is only when dogmatism begins that modesty and candour feel obliged to protest.

R. HINKS.

Sculture del Magazzino del Museo Vaticano.

By GUIDO KASCHNITZ-WEINBERG. Pp. 317: 115 plates. Città del Vaticano, 1937.

The inventory of a lumber-room is not apt to

make very cheerful reading; but so fabulous are the riches of the Vatican collections that even the contents of the magazine are well worth publishing in this elaborate and painstaking manner, and the archaeological world has good reason to be grateful to the Papal authorities and Professor Kaschnitz for making known a whole series of objects whose interest is often more than merely antiquarian. It cannot be pretended, of course, that more than a small proportion of the pieces catalogued here are of much value; but among them are some few which well deserve the time and attention which Professor Kaschnitz has given them. The best way of giving an idea of the scope of his catalogue is to comment upon a few of its more striking contents.

1. A replica of the so-called 'Pherekydes.' K. gives a résumé of the fairly extensive literature which has gathered round this discovery of Amelung's, and which deals mainly with its relation to the version in Madrid and to the group of the Tyrannicides in Naples. K. reports that as a result of experiments with casts it cannot be said that the Vatican head certainly agrees with the structure or pose of the Naples body, so that Amelung's Pherekydes-Aristogeiton equation cannot be taken as proved; on the other hand, in spite of differences of detail, the resemblance of the Vatican head to the Naples Harmodios is sufficiently striking to make it practically certain that the originals were products of the same workshop. Similarly K. notes important discrepancies between the Vatican and Madrid versions of what is thought to be the same original, and confirms Schroder's opinion that the Madrid 'Pherekydes' is so much reworked as to be of little value; the Vatican head thus acquires a considerable importance as evidence for a critical moment in the development of late archaic Attic sculpture.—60. A basalt replica of the head of the Idolino. Experiments conducted with casts again confirm Amelung's identification in the main, though there are interesting points of difference. These seem to be largely due to the translation of bronze technique into that of basalt; the hair of the Florence bronze is more plastic and prominent, that of the Vatican replica flatter and more glyptic. K. regards the Vatican head as an eclectic Augustan version of a fifth century original (he does not accept Furtwängler's attribution of the Idolino to Polykleitos), probably of the Peloponnesian school, and the Idolino as a bronze cast from the original itself (so Lippold, *Köpien u. Umbildungen*, p. 125).—121. A triple herm with two male heads (the one bearded, the other not)

and one female head, the latter being attached to a complete body clothed in a chiton and carved in relief in front of the pillar. Before the two male herms and in front of the lower part of the female figure are three small figures: an Apollo playing the lyre below the bearded herm, an Eros holding a flask below the unbearded one, and a Venus of the Capitoline type in front of the draped female figure. K. tentatively identifies these personages as the Kabeiroi of Samothrake, Axikersos, Axiokersa, and Kadmilos, whose cult was closely connected with that of Hekate—hence the shape of the herm (cf. Rubensohn, *Mysterienheiligtümer in Eleusis und Samothrake*, p. 220). The date of the monument appears to be early Antonine.—284. A group of the Three Graces. K. describes this as a classicistic re-elaboration, probably Antonine in date, of the late Hellenistic prototype, now generally assigned to the second century B.C. K. calls attention to the discrepancy between the post-Praxitelean heads of the end figures and the archaistic hairdressing of the central one.—Among a mass of second-rate Roman hackwork it is surprising and refreshing to come upon a few original Greek fragments, some of very noble descent.—398. A head from one of the Parthenon metopes, identified by Technau (*RM* xlvii (1931), pp. 81 ff., pls 8–10) as belonging to XVI on the south side; it belongs to the figure of Erichthonios, in his combat with the giant Asterios.—399. A fragment of the Parthenon frieze, consisting of the head of one of the youths carrying sacrificial vessels on the north side: since the figures appear as still intact in Stuart's drawing (*Antiquities of Athens*, ii, pl. xxxi), the fragment must have reached the Vatican at some date later than 1751, but nothing further is known about its history.—541. One of the porphyry heads from the sarcophagus of St. Helena, presumably removed when the sarcophagus was reconstructed and repolished in the time of Pius VI; K. reminds us, however, of the possibility that this is one of the modern heads discarded for some reason by the restorers. It is accepted as original by Delbrueck, Sjöqvist and Westholm, and other recent students of the sarcophagus.—The very numerous portrait heads in the Vatican magazine are mostly of poor quality, or gravely damaged or overcleaned; there are, however, one or two which deserve a word of comment: 598. A good Italic head of the early Augustan period. 622. An elderly man, which K. rightly attributes to the period of Nerva, not to the Republic. 727. A statue of a Roman woman as Omphale, with the coiffure of the Severan period. 739. A West

Roman head of about A.D. 500, not given by L'Orange.

R. H.

Museum Benaki. Katalog der Goldschmiede-Arbeiten. By B. SEGALL. Pp. 220 ÷ 69 pl. Athens, 1938.

As Dr. Segall remarks in her Introduction, the collection of which this is the catalogue consists almost entirely of objects from the Eastern Mediterranean. That, from the reader's point of view, is its value, since it has enabled Dr. Segall to devote her whole attention to this most important area. The result is a book which will be of the greatest value when enough material for a general history of Near-Eastern goldsmith's work is known.

The theme of the whole is the continual influx of forms, motives and technical processes from the East. The most striking examples of this are Nos. 1–1b, from Euboea. Details of form and ornament ally these to Cycladic pottery and to pottery from Ahlatlibel, near Ankara, and point to a date about the beginning of the third millennium B.C.: and the latter parallel suggests an ultimate connexion, by way of Central Anatolia, with similar pieces from Ur. The large finds of the Hellenistic period, especially that from Thessaly (Nos. 28–37), force the reader to a parallel conclusion. No. 28 is, on the analogy of an ornament from the Punjab, an Iranian form; Greek parallels from South Russia (as is frequently the case), Macedonia and Thrace are cited. No. 36, on the other hand, is obviously connected with the Roman 'Emblemata' dishes from Boscoreale and elsewhere. This beautiful treasure enables Dr. Segall to write a most illuminating essay on the mixture of elements which forms this Hellenistic art, and to show how largely it depends on the East for its motives and technique.

The Byzantine section illustrates the extraordinary confusion of influences at work during the early Byzantine period. No. 231 is, the author suggests, an example of the Greek revival of the sixth century; No. 270 (with which the pendant from Risano, Dalmatia, in the Ashmolean Museum, is probably connected) points unmistakably to Sassanid Persia. No. 261 is an interesting addition to the series of rings engraved with biblical scenes.

It is difficult to see why Nos. 38–9, a silver hydria and skyphos, have been included without the remainder of the silver in the Museum; the number of printer's errors, especially in the reference numbers to the plates, is deplorable;

and it is a pity that the illustrations are phototypes and not photographs. But these are minor criticisms. This is an excellent book, and it is to be hoped that other portions of M. Benaki's collection will soon be published by hands as expert as Dr. Segall's.

G. BRETT.

Philippes, ville de Macédoine depuis ses origines jusqu' à la fin de l'époque romaine. By PAUL COLLART. Pp. xi — 588 with 88 plates. Paris, 1937. 150 frs.

M. Collart and the French School at Athens are to be warmly congratulated upon the excavations conducted at Philippi and upon this publication, which forms a preface to the more detailed publication of the finds. M. Collart brings to his task some ten years knowledge of the site and of the vicinity; he is, moreover, familiar with the wide literature upon which the varied contacts of Philippi throughout so long a period impinge. His object here is to apply the evidence yielded from archaeological and other sources to the writing of a comprehensive history of Philippi: the result is an interesting and lucidly written book which will earn the esteem of historians and archaeologists alike.

After sketching the history of the plain of Philippi in mediaeval times and recording the researches of travellers down to recent times, M. Collart divides his work into two parts, comprising the history of Philippi down to 42 B.C. and Philippi the Roman Colony. In matters of topography the conclusions of L. Heuzey with regard to the names *Daton*, *Crenides* and *Philippi*, and with regard to the campaigns of 42 B.C., are in general confirmed by recent investigations: the identification of the Thasian *Peraea*, and in particular of *Oesyne* (near *Leftero-Limani*) and of *Neapolis* (*Cavalla*) and *Antisara* (by *Kalamitsa*), has been conclusively established by M. Collart's discovery of ancient remains. In discussing the mineral wealth of this region the author shows that the mines on Mt. *Pangaeum* at *Skaptésule* maintained a regular output; it was from these mines that Thasos minted the coinage which penetrated as far as Germany, and it was to obtain control of these mines that Athens tried without success to conquer the hinterland from *Eion* and *Amphipolis*. On the other hand, the mines near *Crenides-Philippi*, which were called the *Asula*, must soon have been exhausted; when exploited by Philip II they yielded an annual output of 1000 talents, but M. Collart believes this figure cannot have been maintained

for many years. With the exhaustion of the mines, Philippi lost its importance in history, until it became a Roman Colony. In this study of Greek and Macedonian Philippi many problems are clarified, such as the identification of *Drabeskos*, the assessment of Thasos in Attic tribute-lists, and the autonomous status of Philippi within Philip's kingdom; the theatre at Philippi was built by Philip II contemporaneously with the acropolis walls, and the gold coinage issued by Philip II is dated to between 348 and 344 B.C., at which time Philippi lost its autonomy. The second part, entitled 'Philippi the Roman Colony,' covers an equally wide field with thoroughness and with fine judgment: considerable light is thrown upon the Roman wars in Thrace, and the different aspects of the Roman Colony are fully treated under the headings—municipal institutions and population, public life and monuments, cults and beliefs. In the last chapter M. Collart is able to fix the stations of the *Via Egnatia* near Philippi and to trace the minor roads leading from the plain of Philippi. The text throughout is well equipped with full footnotes, and a good index is appended; finally the volume of plates, which contains maps, coin-plates, inscriptions and photographs of the locality and of the archaeological finds, is a valuable addition to a valuable book.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

La Vallée du Spercheios des origines au IV^e siècle. By YVES BÉQUIGNON. Pp. xvi + 400; 23 plates. Paris: de Boccard. 1937.

M. Béquignon, who is already well known for his travels and researches in Northern Greece, in these 400 pages discusses the geography and history of the Spercheios valley, which as a link between Central and Northern Greece is naturally a very suitable subject for specialist treatment. His first section is a description of the physical geography of the region. The second is a discussion of the prehistoric and protohistoric periods from Neolithic times to Homer and the migrations. The third is concerned with the evolution of the valley in historical times down to the close of the fourth century B.C. There are three appendices, on the site of *Alope*, on *Latyia*, and a list of the ancient sites known in the area. There are full indices, a good bibliography, maps and plans and illustrations.

A work of this kind inevitably touches on so many topics that it is difficult to discuss it without harping on details. Generally the book seems to fall between two stools. It is neither a history of the valley nor a historical geography. The

three main sections are long separate essays rather than one connected study of the whole. It might have been wiser if, after his introductory section on physical geography, the author had then frankly made his work a treatise on the historical topography of the region. As it is the effect produced on the reader is rather confusing.

As to the prehistoric period it is remarkable that the author in the course of his travels has not been able to recognise any fresh sites other than the three already known. His account therefore is based on Lianokladi, and he repeats the fundamental error made by Thompson and myself in 1909 in regarding the third stratum as of the Early Iron Age, though all recent research shows clearly that it belongs to the Middle Bronze Age. This naturally prejudices this section. He has no new light to throw on the peculiar 'tholos tomb' reported by Arvanitopoulos at Dranitsa. He dates the close of Neolithic I to 2500 B.C., which seems a century or two too late. He believes that the Neolithic people were invaders from the north who arrived about 3000 B.C. He points out that the obvious routes into the valley are from north or south, and that there is another to the south-west by Liaskovo, and rightly scouts the idea of invasion from the west 'over the passes of Tymphrestus.' He has little new to offer in Homeric topics. Incidentally his objection that Philoctetes occurs only in the Catalogue has been answered by the observation that during the action of the *Iliad* he was in an isolation hospital in Lemnos. After Homer come discussions of the migrations of tribes and gods—problems which seem no nearer satisfactory solutions. This includes a good account of the pyre of Herakles on Mount Oeta.

The third section falls into four divisions. The first deals with Thermopylae and Trachis. He has found ancient foundations at the former which he identifies as a polyandrion. His observations based on a fresh survey of the pass must be given due weight, but it is hard to discuss them except after examination on the spot. The second division treats the sites to the north of the river-mouth, Lamia, Phalara (Stylida) and Echinos. In the third division he provides much new material on the hill district west of Lake Xynias, which is a useful supplement to Stählin's *Hellenische Thessalien*. The routes through the hills are well described, with comments on their feasibility as well as their strategic importance and their defences. He gives plans of many of the forts—e.g., Rentina, Smokovo and Kaitsa. He also deals with the defences of the other routes into the Spercheios valley

from west, north and east. All this is perhaps the more original part of the book, and must be taken into account by any future writer on the historical topography of the region.

The illustrations are good and the sketch plans useful, but the maps, based on the new Greek staff map, might have been made stronger and clearer. Little or no use seems to have been made of numismatic evidence.

A. J. B. WACE.

Recherches Archéologiques à Phères de Thessalie. By YVES BÉQUIGNON. (Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'université de Strasbourg. Fasc. 78.) Pp. 112: 24 plates. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1937. 35 frs.

The exploration of Pherai was begun in 1914 by Dr. Arvanitopoulos after he and Mr. Giannopoulos noticed that geometric bronzes were to be found after rain on the bank of a stream north-west of the village of Velestinos. Trial excavations brought to light fluted column drums of poros, and he concluded rightly that a temple had occupied the site. Further work in 1920 and 1923 revealed the east side of the stepped foundation, and many geometric bronzes were found in *favissae*. The results of these excavations have not been published except in short preliminary reports. M. Béquignon here gives the results of the later explorations which the French School at Athens has undertaken in collaboration with Dr. Arvanitopoulos. The first chapter discusses the position of Pherai and the course of its wall as deduced from ruins still extant. He describes the spring identified as Hypereia, a possible sanctuary of Herakles, one or two tombs and prehistoric settlements. As regards the acropolis, he might have followed Stählin and compared it with that at Tsiatma (Pereia?), where the acropolis is similarly formed by a prehistoric mound of the high type which is also walled.

The work on the temple of Zeus Thaulios, which Dr. Arvanitopoulos discovered, shows that there were two temples: an early one of the sixth and a later temple of the fourth century. Of the former little can be said. There are some fragments of columns and a Doric capital in poros, some antefixes and other architectural fragments. Of the later temple much of the foundation still exists. There are three steps in marble, but conglomerate and poros are the principal materials. The ruins do not permit any sort of reconstruction, but the temple probably had twelve columns on the side and six on the front. The columns were of

marble, but the entablature was in poros covered with stucco, and the sima was adorned with a palmette and lotus pattern in low relief. Round the temple was a geometric cemetery, of which about forty tombs were excavated. Their contents present no exceptional features. In a *favissa* near were found a number of 'primitive' and 'archaic' terracotta figurines, and a great number of bronzes, of which only the samples left in the Volos Museum are briefly described, geometric animals and birds, fibulae, and a griffin head. All the rest, including the best, were transferred to Athens. The final chapter deals with the inscriptions, except those found by Dr. Arvanitopoulos, and there is a useful bibliography. So, though it is welcome as throwing some light on the site of Pherai and the excavations there, this book is far from being complete or final. What is given emphasises all the more the need for an adequate publication of the whole of the important material from the site.

A. J. B. W.

The Frame of the Ancient Greek Maps : with a Discussion of the Discovery of the Sphericity of the Earth. By W. A. HEIDEL. (Am. Geogr. Soc.: Research Series No. 20.) Pp. x + 142. 1937.

As in history, the Ionian thinkers established in geographical research a rational tradition, which Greek cartography illustrates. Even the earliest Greek maps presupposed a frame enclosing the habitable earth, the features of which were referred to this frame, as we give places their position by means of co-ordinate latitudes and longitudes. From the flat disc-earth, on which the summer, winter, and equinoctial sunrise were obvious points of reference, successive discoveries transformed the *oikoumene* into the oblong tri-continental mass of Hecataeus and Herodotus, and the four cardinal limits of this were gradually formulated, together with a median 'equator' and some 'parallels' of longitude. The observations on which this construction rested are discussed by Dr. Heidel in detail, with many interesting comments and elucidations of familiar texts.

Meanwhile, the plane earth ceased to satisfy observers; local differences of the sun's midday altitude led to the notion of *klimata*, and the curvature of the earth's surface along lines of longitude suggested, and was supplemented by, the notion of curvature in latitude, and consequently of sphericity. Ionian respect for tradition, and especially the historical carelessness of Poseidonius, has involved the growth of these

notions in contradictions and obscurity. Dr. Heidel examines the ancient and current attributions of them to successive philosophers from Anaximander onwards; he challenges the views of Berger and Burnet, and argues for a very rapid advance in mathematical geography about 400 B.C. Further advances followed the geographical discoveries of Alexander's explorers, in time for Dicaearchus, as Berger noted, but not (as Dr. Heidel thinks) necessarily proving him to have applied the conception of sphericity to them. Dr. Heidel himself makes a strong case for the first Ionian 'frame' in favour of Anaximander, whose work, with that of his Ionian successors, was fully known to Eratosthenes; and in favour of Eratosthenes as having first taken cognisance of the earth's sphericity in his elaboration of that 'frame.'

Dr. Heidel writes concisely; his argument deserves careful attention, and clears up a difficult and disputed point in the history of geographical theory.

J. L. MYRES.

Die Klassische Kunst Griechenlands. By L. CURTIUS. Pp. 466: 36 plates and 604 text figures. Potsdam, 1938.

IN this volume Dr. Curtius continues his account of the art of the ancient world with a detailed study of art in Greek lands from Minoan times until the threshold of the Hellenistic age. The choice of title may seem strange for a book which deals at considerable length with Minoan, Mycenaean, Geometric and archaic art, but it is justified by Dr. Curtius' conviction that in spite of the many apparent gaps and obscurities in the story, an unbroken artistic tradition runs from Minoan Crete to classical Greece. Minoan-Mycenaean art provides the *Vorspiel* to classical art. This is a difficult case to prove, and Dr. Curtius, admitting the difficulty, is content to leave it as a hypothesis. But one feels that a better case for some sort of continuity could have been made out if the difference between Cretan and mainland art had been emphasised, rather than minimised. For it is in this difference, if anywhere, that the specifically Greek element subsists. Minoan art in its naturalistic, atectonic composition is the antithesis of Greek art, whether Geometric, archaic or classical. But on the mainland Minoan influence, however overwhelming, was an importation. Beneath it survived the Helladic tradition with its strong Geometric and tectonic qualities; and it is this tradition, and not the Minoan, which may have been active in the renaissance of Geometric composition in the late and sub-Mycenaean and Geometric styles.

The Geometric, orientalising and archaic styles Dr. Curtius treats as a single and indivisible development and uses the last term as inclusive of all three. But since he again subdivides his 'archaic' style by three: *der tektonische Stil* (till 600), *die lebendige Natur* (600-540) and *die ausgebildete Form* (540-480), the departure from the accepted scheme is more nominal than real. There are some surprises in the pages on archaic sculpture. The Acropolis Moschophorus, for example, is put as late as 530-520 and there is no mention of Payne's discoveries in connection with the Rampin head, or indeed of his Acropolis catalogue at all.

The arrangement of the main section of the book, that dealing with the classical style proper, is admirable. A short introduction on literary evidence and Roman copies is followed by a refreshingly objective list of the more important monuments (with bibliographies) and by brief accounts of the fifth-century artists and schools. These are certainly the pages which students will find the most valuable, if not the most original. In the remainder of this section Dr. Curtius makes many illuminating observations on the various aspects of classical composition: the naked and draped figure, the treatment of the face and hair, the relief, etc.

The same convenient arrangement obtains in the last section which deals with the 'romanticism' of a fourth century torn between tradition and the new spirit. Dr. Curtius emphasises the political, social, moral and philosophical tendencies which make the ethos of fourth-century art so different from that of the fifth century. With the collapse of the religious ideal of a city-state all those elements which have hitherto been subservient to that ideal, now proclaim their independence and absolute value: the stimulus is secular, derived from nature and the individual, human beauty and human passions, even from the material in which the artist works. And though the flowers are various and exotic, the root is dead.

Dr. Curtius finishes his account with a short essay on the nature of classical Greek art as a whole and in relation to other great periods of art.

One must note in conclusion that very indifferent care has been spent on reading the proofs. A large proportion of the references to figures in the text is wrong: and in this connection one could wish, since the figures are not consecutively numbered, that the practice of giving the number of the page, as well as of the figure, had been adopted at the beginning instead of half-way through the book. The half-

tone figures in the text are of moderate quality and some of the colour-plates are out of register.

D. E. L. HAYNES.

Olympia. Photographed by W. HEGE and described by G. RODENWALDT. Tr. R. P. HINKS. Pp. 54: 94 plates. London, 1936. 21s.

A notice of the original German edition of this book appeared in *JHS*, lvi., 1936, pp. 243, 244. An English translation was well worth making in order that the large public to whom Professor Hege's superb photographs will certainly appeal, may not be denied the complementary pleasure of reading Professor Rodenwaldt's text; for, as Mr. Hinks observes in a graceful introduction, in reading the latter and looking at the former 'we seem to watch the working of a single intelligence and a single sensibility.' This impression of unity in collaboration is in no way disturbed by the present excellent translation.

D. E. L. H.

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. II. The Lloyd Collection, parts vii-viii, Syracuse to Lipara. III. The Lockett collection, part i, Spain-Italy. Edited by E. S. G. ROBINSON. 15 and 12 plates, with text facing. London, Humphrey Milford, 1937 and 1938. 15s. each vol.

The publication of the Lloyd collection is now complete, and students have now at their disposal material for an exact examination of the coinages of Italy and Sicily under Greek influence set out in a manner which leaves little to be desired, except of course the coins themselves. The Lockett collection is of a different kind, and it would be necessary, in order to get the best value from the plates, to keep the *Historia Nummorum* at hand for a guide in the study of them: there are several long series, but the collection as a whole has not apparently been built up with the same aims as the Lloyd collection: it cannot stand by itself, as the Lloyd collection can. This is not meant to disparage its importance: it contains the kind of material for which the *Sylloge* was planned, and makes a substantial contribution to the work of classification by comparison of dies. The editor has expanded the information given in the notes, particularly in regard to symbols and inscriptions: it would be useful if he could go further and suggest approximate dates, as he has done in the series of Metapontum, Thurium, and Velia.

J. G. MILNE.

Inscriptions de Délos : Décrets postérieurs à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 1497-1524). Dédicaces postérieures à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 1525-2219). Par PIERRE ROUSSEL et MARCEL LAUNEY. Pp. v + 260. Paris: H. Champion, 1937. 350 fr.

Inscriptions de Délos : Dédicaces postérieures à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 2220-2528). Textes divers, listes et catalogues, fragments divers postérieurs à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 2529-2879). Par PIERRE ROUSSEL et MARCEL LAUNEY. Pp. iii + 190. Paris: H. Champion, 1937. 350 fr.

These two fascicules, published in rapid succession, have a common preface and table of contents and a continuous pagination, and may therefore be treated for the purpose of this review as forming a single volume.

To describe afresh the form and scope of the *Inscriptions de Délos* is superfluous, partly because previous volumes of the series have been reviewed in this *Journal* (xlvii, 160; l, 351 f.; lv, 250 f.), but more because every serious student of Greek history or epigraphy is by now familiar with this indispensable collection, which by the present volume is brought within measurable distance of completion, lacking only the archaic inscriptions and the concluding indexes. We can wish for nothing better than that the work may be carried to a triumphant conclusion with the same promptitude and the same meticulous care which have characterised its publication hitherto.

The volume before us, in the preparation of which Professor Roussel has received effective assistance from M. Launey, comprises the inscriptions dating from the second Athenian domination of Delos, from 166 B.C. onward, save for the records of the officials in charge of the temple-administration, which were collected in the previous volume. We have here a group of twenty-six decrees of the Athenian people or cleruchs (nos. 1497-1509) or of other states or corporations (1512-24), a brief *senatus consultum* with a covering letter from the Athenian στρατηγοί (1510), the *Lex Gabinia-Calpurnia* of 58 B.C. granting privileges to Delos (1511), and more than a thousand dedications (1525-2528), as well as a considerable number of lists and other miscellaneous documents (2529-2645), mostly of a religious or semi-religious character, and, as is natural on a site subject to earthquake shocks and ruthlessly devastated during the Mithridatic War, a formidable number of fragments (2646-2879), which, though many are apparently worthless, a *corpus* such as the present may not exclude. In all, this volume contains 1397 texts,

of which thirty-three are Latin, twenty-nine bilingual, one Arabic and the remainder Greek—a surprising preponderance in view of the importance of the Italian and oriental elements in the population of the island. The great majority had been previously published, but the stones have, where possible, been re-examined and the texts revised. To say that 423 are here first presented and that a number more had been previously only ‘signalés’ is true, but might be misleading, as this number includes, naturally, most of the insignificant fragments. Nevertheless, among the texts now first published are some of considerable interest (e.g., nos. 1810, 1923, 1949, 2549, 2552, 2627).

To praise the editorial ability of Professor Roussel is needless; he seems incapable of careless work, and though the present reviewer has noted about a score of slips, these are for the most part so trivial in character that little would be gained by detailing them here. Taken as a whole, the work must be regarded as an impressive masterpiece, a worthy consummation of the labours of the many distinguished scholars who have contributed to our knowledge of the rich documentary records of the sacred isle.

M. N. TOD.

An Introduction to Sophocles. By T. B. L. WEBSTER. Clarendon Press. Pp. 202. 12s. 6d.

Studies and Diversions in Greek Literature. By MARSHALL MACGREGOR. Arnold. Pp. 307. 12s. 6d.

The first chapter of Prof. Webster's book is on Sophocles's life, the second on his thought; then follow two chapters on characterisation, two on construction, one on style, and finally a statement of his general conclusions. Sophocles' preserved the traditional religion, only emending and suppressing where necessary to be consistent with contemporary morality. His primary concern was to show his Athenian public great personalities in surroundings where their greatness and their weakness could be displayed. The nobility of Athens was not lacking in such characters, and Sophocles was “like one of the Athenian nobles” (p. 171).

The book is based on a close study of the plays and a wide acquaintance with the modern literature of the subject. It is very well documented. Yet, as an interpretation of Sophocles, it is superficial. The author's approach to his problem is too narrow and subjective.

What are the distinguishing features of the art of Sophocles? Surely we cannot begin to answer

that question until we have described, and not only described but explained, the distinguishing features of Greek tragedy in general. All this is taken for granted. Even then, we still ask, how did the art of Sophocles differ from that of Aeschylus? The first, obvious, concrete difference is that Sophocles abandoned the Aeschylean form of the connected trilogy. This difference is fundamental: yet it is not even discussed.

Sophocles shared the conventional outlook of the Athenian aristocracy—‘the ideal of doing good, *sophrosyne* and *apragmosyne*, the belief in personality and in breed’ (p. 54). Accepting these ideals at their face-value, Webster does not feel the need of explaining them, and he says that they are ‘the essentials of the thought of Sophocles.’ Yet their social origin emerges quite clearly even from his uncritical account of them. ‘In the *Republic*, when the State is founded, each of the classes within it keeps in its own place because of its *sophrosyne*’ (p. 44). That is to say, *sophrosyne* keeps the lower classes in subjection: the cobbler must stick to his cobbling. If the cobbler is recalcitrant, he is a meddler and a democrat. We remember that Plato regarded meddling between the classes as the height of iniquity. ‘Meddling is the ideal of the democrat in Thucydides. Euripides shows us clearly the contrast between meddling and quietness. . . . Echoes of this opposition can be found in Sophocles, and he clearly believes in quietness’ (p. 37). The *apragmosyne* of the Athenian aristocrats was based on the simple fact that they were free from the troublesome necessity of having to work for their living. In the same way, Webster notes the aristocratic belief that ‘women have a different process of growth from men’ and that ‘the slave also has a different process of growth’ (p. 48), but he does not note the glaring fallacy of that belief, nor its significance in a society based on the subjection of women and the exploitation of slave-labour. That these social prejudices constituted limitations to the thought of Sophocles is true and important, but to say that they were the essentials of his thought is to underrate his originality.

Owing to these faults in his approach, Webster’s interpretation of the plays is not only inadequate, but based on a misconception of the nature of tragedy. One example must suffice. ‘In the *Tyrannus* both Apollo and his ministers are triumphantly justified and the scepticism of Iocasta and Oedipus condemned. Sophocles is supporting the traditional religion against contemporary attacks. . . . Sophocles wrote the *Tyrannus* to defend what was for him, as for

Socrates, one of the basic facts of religion’ (p. 23).

What does the scepticism of Oedipus amount to? When doubt was cast on his parentage, he consulted the Oracle. When the Oracle predicted that he would kill his father and marry his mother, he resolved never to return to the country where he believed his parents to be living. When Thebes was afflicted with the plague, he sent Creon to consult the Oracle. When the Oracle demanded the expulsion of the criminal, he led the search himself. Faith in Apollo had been the governing motive of his life. Not only had he done all he could to avert his predicted destiny, but it was through what he did to avert it that his destiny was fulfilled. If Sophocles intended this play as a vindication of Apollo, it is more damning than any of Euripides’s indictments.

It is true that, when he hears of the death of Polybus, Oedipus abandons his faith in the first part of the oracle, but that is because, since he believes Polybus to be his father, that part of the oracle now seems *impossible* of fulfilment; and he is still as apprehensive as ever about the other part (988, 1007). It is also true that Iocasta seeks to reassure him by expressing doubts about divine providence in general, but her doubts, too, are dictated by the apparent logic of events, and even she is careful to draw a distinction between Apollo and his ministers (712). The effect of this distinction, on which Sophocles has already insisted through the mouth of the Chorus (499), is that the religious issue is excluded. The value of the doubts expressed by Oedipus and Iocasta is not religious, but *tragic*: the oracle seems impossible of fulfilment at the very moment when its fulfilment is being proved. Such a situation is tragic in the sense in which Aristotle used the term *peripeteia*—‘the transformation of the action into its opposite.’ When we have succeeded in analysing this principle of *peripeteia*, which Aristotle regarded as a primary characteristic of the art of tragedy, and perfected by Sophocles, we shall have touched the root of the problem; but in Webster’s book the principle of *peripeteia* is not so much as mentioned.

The late Prof. MacGregor’s *Studies and Diversions* belong to a venerable tradition of literary criticism which seems very remote from the strenuous times in which we live. The glory that was Greece is a secluded garden full of beauty and fruitful in ennobling ideas. The essays cover Aeschylus, Sophocles, Alciphron, Aelian and the *Anthology*, all written in a style of conscious literary elaboration. They contain some good things—

notably the sensible remarks about Darius in the *Persae* and the excellent discussion of the burial of Polynices in the *Antigone*. In general, however, where the author is devoting himself to serious criticism and not the pastime of a leisure hour, they reveal the same approach as Webster's—less narrow but more vague. 'If we are to attempt further to particularise the greatness of the soul of Sophocles, we might best perhaps describe it as τὸ καλόν, a word difficult to translate but signifying a serene and splendid nobility and beauty' (p. 88). This kind of criticism does not help much, and I would suggest that, if further progress is to be made in the interpretation of Greek tragedy, it must be studied objectively, as Aristotle studied it, in relation to the general history of primitive, oriental, European and above all Elizabethan drama.

G. THOMSON.

Portrait of Socrates. By SIR R. W. LIVINGSTONE. Oxford, Clarendon Press 1938. Pp. lvi + 200. 6s.

The sub-title of this book gives the outline of its contents: 'The Apology, Crito and Phaedo of Plato in an English translation with introductions and notes.' The translation is, with a few alterations, that of Jowett: the main introduction (xi-lvi) comprises a sketch of the political and intellectual background to the life of Socrates; an account of his methods of teaching, his trial and the probable reasons for his condemnation; an assessment of his importance as a thinker and as a man; a short treatment of the problem of the Platonic and Xenophontic Socrates; a note on the dialogue form; and, in conclusion, notes on the meaning of certain Greek words (φιλοσοφία, δίκαιος-δικαιοσύνη, καλός, σωφροσύνη), which are the expression of moral, social and intellectual ideas peculiar to the Greeks, and which therefore the best translation can hardly render to the satisfaction of the Greekless reader. There is further a separate introduction to each of the dialogues. The notes, which have been kept within very moderate proportions, are, to the great advantage of the reader, placed at the bottom of each page; and the text of the translation is interrupted at suitable points by paragraphs of analysis and interpretation in the manner of the 'running commentary' made familiar to scholars by Professor Cornford's editions of the more scientific Platonic dialogues. As a work of scholarship *Portrait of Socrates* would not claim to be compared with these: the aim of the book is to present, through the medium of three of Plato's greatest dramatic dialogues, the

personality of Socrates, for the benefit of 'the ordinary educated person who wishes not to go through the world in ignorance of some of the greatest things in it, but who knows little or no Greek': and it can be said that the book, both by its planning and its execution, has completely achieved this aim. In *Plato To-day* Mr. R. H. S. Crossman concludes that it is Socrates, not Plato, who is of value to the modern world; in Socrates, too, is incarnate the ideal of the 'unattached' man which Mr. Aldous Huxley preaches in *Ends and Means*. If, then, the modern world is interested in Socrates, Sir Richard Livingstone has performed the great service of presenting Socrates in a way in which the modern world, distrustful of 'interpretations,' yet unwilling to go to the trouble of reading the original texts, may be disposed to comprehend him.

J. S. MORRISON.

Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, Vol. III (Indices). By H. DIELS; ed. W. KRANZ (5th ed.). Pp. 654. Berlin 1937-8. Export price, RM 30.75.

In the preface to the fourth edition of the *Fragmente*, Hermann Diels expressed himself scarcely able to hope that it would be possible for his book ever to achieve in a fifth edition a more complete and convenient form—to assume, in fact, through the incorporation in the text of the many additions and corrections, which had previously been merely subjoined as supplements, its final and definitive shape. This unconfidently entertained hope was realised as far as the text was concerned by the appearance in 1934 and 1935 of the first two volumes of Kranz's edition: now the demands of convenience and completeness are conclusively satisfied in the third volume, which contains the indices (Wortindex, Namenregister, Stellenregister), augmented and thoroughly revised. In no part of the work have Kranz's labours been more extensive or more useful than here. Diels died before the preparation of the fourth edition was finished, and Kranz was then responsible for the *Nachträge* to the third volume, which had not been revised since the second edition. He admitted that for the indices, which were particularly defective on the doxographical (A) sections of each article, complete revision was even more imperative than for the rest of the work, and that little could be done to remedy these deficiencies by means of *Nachträge*, which were in the main supplementary lists compiled from the doxographies and fragments added in the third and fourth editions. In the new edition the incor-

poration of the *Nachtrage* and the correction of all references to suit the new pagination are advantages of convenience which are of minor importance beside the advantage of completeness. Use alone will show to what extent this has been achieved, but it may be noted that under the heading ἀγαθός (pp. 7-9) there are seventeen additional references (above those which appear in the *Nachtrage* of the fourth edition). It is unfortunate that the first additional entry, a cross reference on page 7 (a 29), should contain a misprint: S 8 b 39 should read S 7 b 39.

In conclusion, the publishers are to be congratulated on maintaining the high standard of printing and general arrangement set by the earlier volumes of the new edition.

J. S. MORRISON.

A Lexicon to Herodotus. By J. ENOCH POWELL. Pp. xii + 392. Cambridge University Press. 1938. 42s.

This is a quite invaluable addition to our equipment for the study of Herodotus: for Schweighauser's *Lexicon Herodoteum* (1824) and Cary's edition of it (1842) are valueless. It is based on a complete collection of word-slips made in 1912-14 under the direction of Prof. W. Aly of Freiburg, and Prof. Powell's whole material is now permanently available in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The book is an index (κσι only excepted) as well as a lexicon where meanings are classified and translated. Hude's text is used, but important MS. variants are noted. Special signs denote words not cited in Liddell and Scott² from a writer earlier than Herodotus: a few variant or special usages; and the vocabulary of speeches.

Occasionally one might transfer a passage from one subheading of meaning to another. But otherwise it is the reviewer's pleasant duty to welcome and commend Powell's work without qualification.

J. L. MYRES.

Homère. Hymnes. By JEAN HUMBERT. pp. 254. 1936.

Xénophon. Helléniques, I-III. By J. HATZFELD. pp. 159. 1936.

Héliodore. Les Ethiopiques. Vols. I and II. Text by R. M. RATTENBURY and T. W. LUMB. Translation by J. MAILLON. Vol. I, pp. ci + 124, 1935. Vol. II, pp. iii + 164, 1938. Paris. Association G. Budé.

Plutarque. Sur les Oracles de la Pythie. By R. FLACELIÈRE. Pp. 175. Paris. Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres.

In the Budé edition of the Homeric Hymns a new and eminently sensible arrangement is

adopted, whereby all the hymns to any particular deity are grouped together under that deity's name, and not scattered, as in the MSS. and other editions, while a concordance is given on p. 254, with the editions of Baumeister, Gemoll, and Allen and Sikes. The introduction discusses the character, period, ancient notices, MSS., and editions of the Hymns, and includes some wise remarks on the translation of stock epithets of disputed meaning. The text is founded on that of Goodwin, and obligation is acknowledged also to the edition of 1904 by Allen and Sikes, though the new edition of 1936 by Allen, Sikes, and Halliday appeared too late to be much used. Each group of hymns is preceded by a notice of varying length. Among these notices that to the Hymn to Apollo (pp. 61 ff.) will be of interest as accepting the division of that hymn by Ruhnken, Jacoby, and others into a short, complete Delian hymn (ll. 1-178) and a longer and inferior Pythian continuation (ll. 179-546). H. dates the first c. 700 and the second c. 590, but he commits himself to no view about a recension by the rhapsode Kynaithos such as Mr. Wade-Gery¹ put forward in the same year, no doubt too late for mention.

The first volume of the Hellenica in this series has already been reviewed by Mr. Marchant in *CR* 1937, pp. 123 ff., so far as the text is concerned. For the historian, the introduction does its work well. M. Hatzfeld concludes, against Nitsch and De Sanctis, that there was no definite interruption in the composition of the second (II 3, 10-end) of the portions into which the *Hell.* is usually regarded as falling. Nor does he believe that the first portion was later added as a preface to the second, but accepts the common view that the *Anabasis*, in which X. found his true manner, was written between the two sections of the *Hell.*, and that that accounts for the change of style in the latter. I-II 3, 9 he puts about 390, the end of III after 380, and the middle of VI at 358-55, while allowing continual revision until the author's death in 355. X.'s sympathy for Sparta is noted, but it is denied that he was unfair to Athens, though he hated Thebes. He is criticised for a superficial view of events and for an historical outlook which marks a retreat from Thucydides to Herodotus.

The appearance of the first volume of the Budé Heliódorus in 1935 was an important event for scholarship, and we are now favoured in 1938 with the second. The achievement of Messrs. Rattenbury and Lumb in at last constituting a sound text receives due praise from Sir

¹ Kynaithos, in *Greek Poetry and Life*, pp. 56 ff.

Stephen Gaselee in *CR* 1936, pp. 65-6: it remains to point out other merits which will appeal to the general reader. In Section I of the editors' introduction Mr. Rattenbury, discussing the authorship, considers it possible that the Heliodorus who wrote the novel was indeed the later Bishop of Tricca, as reported by Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, in the fourth century, but naturally contends that the book, whenever written, must belong to a pre-Christian period in its author's life. He is led by the concluding sentence, which states that H. was a Phoenician of Emesa, and of the race of the Sun, to connect him with the time when Emesa was specially important in the Roman Empire under Helio-gabalus and Severus Alexander, both natives. The work of Rohde has made it natural to link any Greek novelist with the second Sophistic at some date from the Flavians to Julian, and R. himself was struck by the resemblance of H. to Philostratus, the biographer of Apollonius of Tyana, which would again relate him to the Severi, patrons of the Philostrati. In section II the novel itself is discussed, and, if the characterisation is not highly praised, except for some tribute to Calasiris, H. is nevertheless awarded the palm among the novelists for skilled arrangement and narrative power. Section III contains an elaborate discussion of the twenty-two MSS., of which only nine deserve attention. section IV reviews editions and explains that in the present one H. is not forced to write better Attic than he knew. Two Appendices follow, one on some variants in the MSS, the other on certain difficult passages. Finally there is a Preface by the translator, M. Maillon, which treats of the novel's composition—so like that of a film scenario—the religious ideas of H., his style, his standing in antiquity and also—a subject touched by Mr. Rattenbury—his influence during the Middle Ages and since the Renaissance, the most illustrious debtor being Racine. The second volume, apart from a discussion of a new dissertation on the MSS, contains the text and translation of Books IV-VII. It is to be hoped that the third will not be long in appearing.

While an Englishman can offer no views on the translations, except that they seem clear and accurate, let it be said that these volumes, all of them adorned with useful footnotes by the translators on points too small for fuller treatment, can be recommended as valuable additions to a series which deserves every encouragement.

The new edition of one of Plutarch's perhaps more tediously pious works should be extremely useful to the literary scholar, to the student of ancient religion, and also to the archaeologist

and topographer. There is a long introduction. Section I analyses the dialogue. Section II dates it at the beginning of the reign of Hadrian and near the end of the author's life, not long after the *De E. Delphico*, but considerably later than the *De Defectu Oraculorum*. Section III (literary) points out the careful and largely successful imitation of Plato's composition and style, discusses the reasons why the Pythia no longer answer in verse, and estimates the character as drawn by Plutarch. Section IV outlines Plutarch's theory of inspiration as the direct effect, with no intermediary daemons, of Apollo on the soul, not the body, of the Pythia, whose imperfections and not the god's, disfigure the responses. Plutarch's objections to the Epicurean and Stoics views of religious inspiration are described and followed by an account of Apollo as identified with the universal sun-god needed by a Delphian faith which claimed to lead the revived Greek world-culture of Hadrian. Section V is an exhaustive comparison of Plutarch's references to monuments with the results of modern excavation at Delphi, assisted by a plan of the sanctuary at the end. The translation, from the most recent Teubner text with slight changes, reads easily and clearly.

E. D. PHILLIPS.

Iamblichi De Vita Pythagorica Liber. Editio L. DEUBNER. Pp. xx + 158. Teubner, 1937.

This edition, which is also the first volume to appear in the new, larger, Teubner format, was announced to be in preparation as early as 1914. In that year vol. IX of Pauly Wissowa was published, in which s.v. *Iamblichos* the following remark is to be found in col. 646: 'Eine neue kritische Ausgabe von L. Deubner ist bei Teubner angekündigt, und wird hoffentlich bald erscheinen.' There is therefore the more reason to be glad that this hope is now realised. The volume replaces the edition of A. Nauck (St. Petersburg, 1884). The text is based upon Codex Laurentianus 86. 3, of saec. XIV in the portion which contains the Life. This manuscript, though regarded by Lucas Holstein and Cobet as the archetype, and since reinstated as such by Pistelli in 1888, was not so treated by Nauck, whose apparatus was disfigured by too many valueless readings, better ignored, drawn from the numerous copies. But D. does not altogether despise such copies as Parisinus 2093 of saec. XV., Parisinus 1981 of saec. XVI, and Cizensis of saec. XVI, which he has found useful as embodying, where they differ, some competent conjectures by the copyists. He also

acknowledges debts to the editions of Arcerius (1598) amplified by Lucas Holstein (vixit. 1596-1661) (Carte Allacci XCVII in the Vallicelli Library) to the Latin versions of Holstein, and of Obrecht (1700), to the conjectures of Scaliger noted in the copy of Arcerius' editions now in the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, or found by Pistelli in Leidensis Tib. Hemsterhuisii 17, to marginal notes by Rohde and Wilamowitz in their copies of Kiessling's and Nauck's editions respectively, and lastly to Diels, who made corrections in the portions of the Life quoted in Vol. I of his *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1934). Nauck's practice is followed in the addition of select testimonia, and use has been made of Delatte's edition of Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Pythagoras*, to which the reader is referred for fuller references. Other sources are enumerated in the closing four pages of the Preface: these include numerous articles and editions of other books. The result is a text considerably more conservative than Nauck's, with a useful conspectus of the most recent literature, made more complete by the delay in publication.

E. D. P.

Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Gorgian Commentaria. Edidit W. NORVIN.

This new Teubner text replaces that of Jahn (*Arch. f. Phil. u. Paed.* XIV, Leipsic) published in 1848, which was based on inferior copies of the Codex Marcianus Graecus 196 (saec. IX) in the Library of San Marco, Venice. The editor has therefore had merely to examine the original, with little deference to the numerous copies, and to correct it in places where it was manifestly corrupt. A discussion of this MS. will be found in the same editor's *Olymp. in Plat. Phaedonem Comm.*, Teubner 1913. N. refers rather mysteriously to a 'libellus lingua vernacula complures annos abhinc elaboratus' in which he treats questions bearing on his textual argument. This on consulting the British Museum Catalogue, I find to be his Danish dissertation *Olympiodorus fra Alexandria og hans Commentar til Platons Phaidon*, Studier i den graeske Philosophis Historie, Gyldendal, Copenhagen and Christiania 1915. The relevant chapter is c. I, De nyplatoniske Skoler og deres Platonexegese, pp. 18 ff. Further remarks are promised in the Prolegomena to be added to his edition of the other commentaries of Olympiodorus. Like Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* in this series, this volume is equipped with full references to the passages of Plato and other authors to which Ol. alludes, and with an Index Locorum as well as Nominum.

E. D. P.

Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris. By M. PLATNAUER. Pp. xix + 186. Oxford, 1938. 6s.

This volume is the first to appear of the new Oxford series of editions of Euripides' plays, in which the Oxford text of Murray is made the subject of commentaries intended to help the learners and at the same time to be useful to the advanced scholar. Mr. Platnauer's *Iphigenia in Tauris* therefore contains in its notes far more textual criticism than is usually found in school editions: indeed his purpose is that textual problems shall be forced upon the attention of any user of the book even at an age when the actual Greek studied is assumed to be divinely transmitted. This makes for a certain austerity, which would prevent the book from being used below the top classical forms in schools, however valuable it might prove to undergraduates. Grammatical points are thoroughly discussed, and a metrical scheme of the whole work is given at the end, with notes. The introduction, which is necessarily short because of the greater bulk of the notes, contains sections on general literary criticism, on the origin and growth of the legend of Iphigenia from three different elements called the Attic goddess, the Tauric goddess, and the human Iphigenia, and on the date, scenery, and construction of the play. Admirable as these are in their summary of the questions to be considered, one user of the book at least regrets that they had to be so brief, and in particular that some reference was not made in the first section to the perennial topic of the rationalism of Euripides as applied to a romantic legend. It would also have been interesting, without being irrelevant, to add to the query whether the *Iphigenia in Tauris* is really a tragedy at all, some remarks on the relation of plots of this type to their successors, those of the New Comedy and the Hellenistic Novel.

E. D. P.

Xenophon's Anabasis, II. By R. E. SNAITH. Pp. viii + 134. 2s.

Euripides' Hecuba. By F. W. KING. Pp. viii + 162. 2s. 6d.

G. Bell and Sons, London, 1938.

These two volumes of Messrs. Bell's new series of school classics belong to a type, now becoming common, in which a special effort is made to bring the ancient world to life for the beginner by means of suitable illustrations, mainly photographs. Mr. Snaith's *Anabasis* is embellished with reproductions which include the frieze from Susa shewing the Persian royal guards, the Darius vase, a coin of Tissaphernes, vase-paintings of Greek soldiers, photographs of the moun-

rainous country in Asia Minor, a remarkable infra-red aerial view of the Euphrates near Baghdad, and a view of the Alpheus valley, where X. lived and wrote in retirement. The Introduction describes adequately the relations of Greece and Persia, the march of the Ten Thousand, the life of X. and the order and equipment of the Persian armies. Mr. King's *Hecuba* is illustrated by photographs of the theatre of Dionysus and the south side of the Acropolis at Athens, and of the auditorium and *orchestra* at Epidaurus, by views of Delos and of the Eurotas valley, by reproductions of vase paintings depicting scenes from heroic life and of a striking statuette of a tragic actor. The Introduction includes sections on Athenian Drama, Euripides, the *Hecuba*, and the Greek Theatre. Both books contain full vocabularies as well as simple notes.

E. D. P.

Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan Excavations at Sepphoris, Palestine, in 1931. LEROY WATERMAN, Director. University of Michigan Press 1937. Pp. xii + 86; 30 plates. \$2.00.

Although Sepphoris, 'ornament of all Galilee,' was at the beginning of the first Christian century second only to Jerusalem in all Palestine, until 1931 no attempt was made to verify its claims by the test of the spade. The present volume is a preliminary report of the excavations undertaken on the site by the University of Michigan from July to September 1931.

Section I, Architecture and Topography, by N. E. Manasseh, contains a description of a small fort on the Tell, the lower courses of which date to the Crusades, the corner-stones being Roman sarcophagi, but which has been restored in modern times, especially in the reign of Abdul Hamid; a Christian basilica; in the North East face of the Tell a Greco-Roman theatre, the existence of which was hitherto unknown, a semicircular building of 37 metres in radius made to seat 4000-5000; an oil-press similar in plan to the one mentioned in Vitruvius vi, 6, 3, and the remains of an elaborate water-works system to the east of the village. The text is generously illustrated by 44 photographs.

Section II, by S. Yeivin, consists of historical and archaeological notes. Ancient Sepphoris, 4 miles North West of Nazareth, is to a great extent buried under the modern Arab village of Šaffuriyye, and though no definite document (except coins) has been found, identification is certain. Sepphoris does not figure in any of the pre-exilic sources for the history of Palestine, or in the Old Testament, or in any cuneiform or

hieroglyphic documents, the first mention of the town being in Josephus. A brief history of Sepphoris is followed by an attempt to date the buildings described in Section I. Parts of the Fort may belong to the Palace of Herod Antipas, and the Theatre may well have been built by him too, though Waterman (in a footnote) favours his father as the original builder. Mention is also made of finds consisting of pottery and small objects of daily use of bronze and iron and bone and ivory, some of which are shown on Plate I.

In Section III, a Catalogue of the Coins, by Catherine S. Bunnell, identifiable coins range in date from the Seleucid period (Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, 187 B.C.) to Arab times, ninth century A.D. 51 pages of careful and detailed description are accompanied by 5 plates having 140 illustrations. This is a pleasing and workman-like volume containing all that we have any right to look for in a preliminary report.

J. M. R. CORMACK.

Churches at Bosra and Samaria-Sebaste.

By J. W. CROWFOOT. British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, Supplementary Paper 4, 1937. Pp. viii + 39; 17 plates. 5s.

I. The Cathedral at Bosra, capital of the Roman province of Arabia formed by Trajan in A.D. 106, and lying over 70 miles to the south of Damascus, is important in the history of ecclesiastical architecture because it is one of the largest centralised churches in the East, and more than 20 years older than Santa Sophia. After giving a sketch of the history of Bosra, the author summarises previous work on the Cathedral, and states the unsolved problems which led to the expeditions of May 1934 and March 1935. The recognition of the importance of the Bosra Cathedral dates from M. Vogué's work *Syrie Centrale* in 1865. The main features of the plan were plain, but it was not clear how the great circle of the nave had originally been roofed. Vogué's own suggestion was a dome 19 metres in diameter carried on eight great piers.

In 1909 Butler found the base of a composite pier under the north wall of the late chapel and he restored a dome 26 metres in diameter, but the real problem was still unsolved. Among the circumstances which led Mr. Crowfoot to undertake the expedition to Bosra was the discovery in 1929 at Jerash of a church of S. John the Baptist, a little Bosra, finished in 532, twenty years after the Bosra church, which, however, threw little light on the roofing problem at Bosra. The soundings taken in

May 1934 and March 1935 led to this solution. Originally there were four semi-circular colonnades in the middle of the church arranged in the form of a quatrefoil or tetraconch, with four columns in each colonnade standing on high pedestals.

We may conclude that the Bosra Cathedral was not as Butler thought, 'at the time of its erection, one of the largest domed churches in the world'—in fact it probably had no dome of any kind. It has, however, two claims on our attention: firstly, it was a large congregational church built on a centralised plan in one of the wealthier cities of Syria; secondly, there is no other large centralised church of the period of which we know so much. The features which invite comparison with other ancient architectural remains are the plan of the walls round the nave, the quatrefoiled colonnades in the middle, the position of the chancel, the lighting provided by the clerestory and the style of the stone-work, all of which are fully discussed.

II. A Greek Church and Monastery of S. John the Baptist at Sebaste. At the opposite end of the hill of Samaria from the remains of the twelfth-century Latin Cathedral stood the church which is discussed in the second part of this volume. The first certain reference to the site of the church is by Joannes Phocas in 1185, and it is referred to again in 1282 by Burchard and in 1420 by John Poloner. It was stumbled on by accident in 1931 during a Joint Expedition under the auspices of Harvard University, the Palestine Exploration Fund and The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

In this section the preliminary account published by Mr. Crowfoot in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, January 1932, pp. 28–33, is amplified by a full description and analysis of the church. The earliest church of which traces have been found dates from the sixth or early seventh century, as do the mosaics, while the second building was a church of the later four-column Byzantine type of the end of the eleventh century. In the middle of the east wall is a niche with two paintings: the Martyrdom of S. John and the Invention of the Head of the Baptist (see coloured frontispiece for an example). Whatever the date assigned to these paintings, there can be no doubt that all that is best in both church and chapel dates from the second half of the twelfth century, when the Latin Cathedral was building. The sumptuous illustrations which grace an admirably written text are not the least attractive feature of this excellent work.

J. M. R. CORMACK.

Antioch-On-The-Orontes. II. The Excavations, 1933–36. Edited by RICHARD STILLWELL. Pp. vii + 223: 80 pls. Princeton University Press. 1938.

The hopes raised by the excavations of the Capital of the Seleucids were not realised with the publication of *Antioch-On-The-Orontes I* in 1934 embodying the results of the preliminary excavations of 1932, for beyond the mosaics nothing of great importance was found. After five more campaigns the mosaics still hold the field: they are quite the most spectacular find to date. In Antioch itself the most important topographical information obtained is the location of the Island, the main streets and the cemeteries, but the suburb Daphne continues to outdo the main city in richness of finds.

The Committee for the Excavation of Antioch feel that finds should be reported with as little delay as possible, and therefore it is emphasised that this is not a definitive and analytical publication, but merely a statement of the facts, fuller discussions being promised later. In this present volume, for example, appears a full catalogue of sculpture, complete with excellent photographs (about 100), but no attempt is made to date the pieces on stylistic or technical grounds. So far no coins or pottery appear, but these, with an article on architecture, are promised later.

As in Vol. I, the major contributions are by M. Lassus, who contributes (in French) a minute study, illustrated by numerous photographs (two aerial) and plans, of a fourth century cruciform church, a monument of considerable importance for the study of ecclesiastical architecture of the early Christian period. The church lies not in Antioch proper, but on the right bank of the Orontes, 300 metres W. of the Antioch–Alexandretta road. The greatest yield of artistic mosaics comes from a Villa at Daphne-Yakto which forms the subject of a study also by M. Lassus, who makes two suggestions as to the purpose of this vast building complex, first begun in the third century and reconstructed in the fifth. It may have been a club or a Haremlik with its Selamlık. No one will complain that there are over 200 photographs of mosaics (mostly from the Villa) in addition to the catalogue, with full descriptions of each piece and indications of the colours, for these are quite the cream of the published material.

D. N. Wilber contributes an article on the Theatre at Daphne excavated in 1934–5. No inscriptions have been found to identify it with any monument in the literary sources, but it

seems to have been built in the last quarter of the first century. Its seating capacity was approximately 6000, and it may have been planned from the start for use in *naumachiae*. An essay on the Plateau of Daphne: the Springs and the Water System Leading to Antioch is also by Mr. Wilber.

The Greek and Latin inscriptions (about 100) are a continuation of the series edited in Vol. I, pp. 52-3. Glanville Downey publishes these from squeezes, photographs and copies. Many are funerary, and most are fragmentary. The complete set of indices is helpful. Mr. Downie also writes on the shrines of St. Babylas at Antioch and Daphne, and on John of Gaza and the Mosaic of Ge and Karpoi. Eight Kufic inscriptions are edited by N. A. Faris from squeezes and photographs, a continuation of the series by Hitti in Vol. I, pp. 54-7. This is a very handsome volume, prodigally illustrated, but perhaps something cheaper and less elaborate would have been sufficient for a preliminary report.

J. M. R. CORMACK.

Ambix. The Journal of the Society for the Study of Alchemy and Early Chemistry. Vol. I. London, 1937.

Students of the classics, if they have any breadth of outlook beyond the cramped confines of a self-imposed and only recently traditional scholasticism, will welcome the appearance of an authoritative periodical dealing with alchemy and the origins of chemistry. The chemistry of Pliny is tolerably well known to classicists, but there must be comparatively few who would recognise any Democritus save him of Abdera. Indeed, the scientific writings of the ancients are strangely little read, and probably least of all by the professional scholars.

It is possibly to be regretted that the mantle of obscurity has fallen upon the modern students of alchemy. Some of the articles in *Ambix* are mere journalism: others show only too clearly that their authors prefer a welter of obscure erudition to a critical search after truth. However, enthusiasts may be permitted to be esoteric while their cult is but newly revived.

Quite by the way, readers of Theocritus might wonder, after reading an article on 'The Origins of Greek Alchemy,' whether Simaetha in the *Pharmaceutriae* melted her wax on an alchemist's *κηροτάκης*.

E. J. A. KENNY.

Περιοδικὸν τοῦ ἐν Χίῳ Συλλόγου Ἀργέντη, ἐκδιδόμενον καθ' ἑξαμηνίαν. Τόμος πρῶτος, ἔτους Α', τεῖχος ιον. Athens, Περικλέους 18-20. 1938. Annual subscription 7s.

In 1932 Mr. Philip Argenti founded in his native Chios the Argenti *Syllogos*, and with it a museum intended to illustrate all aspects of life in the island. Chios has very special claims on our interest, both for its history and for its local dialect, with its very archaic tinge, and now the Argenti *Syllogos* has started this periodical for the publication of material of all sorts relating to the island. In the hundred pages of this first issue there are sixteen articles, and all are of interest: the reader may particularly welcome the name of Mr. Stylianos Vios, with his articles on pot-making, on names of women adapted from those of their husbands, on traditions about treasures, on dialect words not in the dictionaries, and lastly on agricultural lore, the present article being devoted to the famous mastich of Chios. Important, too, is the article of Mr. George Madias on words used by shepherds. These must serve as samples of this first gleanings, and they are enough to show that we have here a periodical which can hold its own well with other local periodicals of Greece. May this issue be the first of a long series.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Bibliographie Balkanique, 1937. Compiled by LÉON SAVADJIAN. Seventh volume, including *Memento Encyclopédique des Balkans, 1937*. Paris: Société Générale d'Imprimerie et d'Édition, 1938. 100 *frs*.

A continuation for the year 1937 of the useful Balkan Bibliography. The series embraces publications in French, English, Italian and German, relating to Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Roumania, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Central Europe. The arrangement is by countries, with titles in alphabetical order, and there is an index of authors at the end. Short summaries of the articles are given in many cases. The work contains also the titles of the principal articles published in reviews in 1937, and a précis of the chief political events, with brief descriptions of the countries concerned. F. H. MARSHALL.

Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ Ποιητικῆς. Translation by the late SIMOS MENARDOS. Introduction, text and commentary by the late I. ΣΥΚΟΥΤΡΙΣ. Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν. Ἑλληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, 2. Pp. 148 + 285. Athens: Kollaros. 1937.

This second volume of the Ἑλληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, a modern revival of the well-known series

of Koraes, issued under the auspices of the Athens Academy, is devoted to Aristotle's *Poetics*, and is marked by the same scholarly care and wealth of information displayed in the opening volume. Some lack of homogeneity and some incompleteness are due to the circumstances under which the book was produced. The translation is the work of the distinguished scholar Simos Menardos, first General Secretary of the Academy, who died in 1933. But it seems to have been made before 1912, and its style is a severe καθαρεύουσα, which, the editor acknowledges, would not have been adopted at the present day. It is of interest that Menardos's occupation with the *Poetics* appears to have derived impulse from personal contact with Ingram Bywater.

The editor's task of revising the translation from Menardos's manuscript can have been no light one, but the task of dealing with the difficult original text and of writing the commentary and long introduction must have been far heavier. A note appended to the last page of the incomplete introduction informs us that the remainder could not be written owing to the editor's sudden death. Thus a chapter planned to give a description of the MSS, a critical survey of the principal editions and a detailed bibliography is wholly wanting.

The series of the 'Ελληνική Βιβλιοθήκη is designed for the general educated reader rather than the professed scholar, and, apart from the inevitable omission already alluded to, the present edition gives the general reader all, and indeed more than all, he has a right to expect. The professed scholar, too, will find it of considerable value. Though no independent collation of the MSS has been attempted, the critical notes on the text are ample, and include some conjectures by Mr. Sykouris. The editor emphasises that accuracy rather than originality has been his aim, and this aim has been fulfilled. The introduction, in the first chapter, discusses the character, the obscurities, the date, the sources and the arrangement of the *Poetics*, and also the question of the existence of a second book. The second chapter deals with Aristotle's use of certain terms, such as *μίμησις* and *μῦθος*, his conception of poetry, and the reason for his neglect of lyric poetry and concentration on tragedy. The editor's remarks on the difference between ancient and modern ideas of poetry are interesting. The commentary may perhaps be regarded by the scholar as over-full, but it is not too full for the general reader.

This 'first and only Modern Greek' edition of the *Poetics*, excellently produced as regards

printing and paper, can be warmly commended.

F. H. MARSHALL.

Ἐπικτήτου Ἐγχειρίδιον, Μάρκου Αυρηλίου τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν (δευτέρη ἐκδόσι διορθωμένη), Κλεάνθους Ὑμνος εἰς Δία. Translated by S. DELTA. Pp. 253. Athens. 1935.

Αἱ κατ' Ἀρριανὸν Ἐπικτήτειοι Διατριβαί. Translated by S. DELTA. Pp. 338. Athens: Sideris. 1937.

These unpretentious translations are the work of a genuine lover of the Stoic teachings of Epictetus, as recorded by his Boswell Arrian, and of Marcus Aurelius. The translation of the 'Hymn to Zeus' has been added as presenting the religious basis of Stoicism. Mr. Delta is a firm believer in the moral value of these works in an age like the present, when mere material enjoyment is so prominent.

The translations are written in moderate demotic, and read clearly and pleasantly. The translator has been fully aware of the difficulties and obscurities, especially in the case of the 'Thoughts' of Marcus Aurelius. The debts to previous translators and annotators are fully acknowledged. The translations are accompanied by introductions and notes suited to the needs of the general reader. The scope of these books reminds one in many ways of the translations of the same authors by George Long, and these have indeed been used by the present translator. Though naturally intended for the Greek general reader, foreigners who take an interest in Modern Greek will find them instructive. Phrases like *κάθημαι ποιῶν τι* cannot be accurately translated without a knowledge of the Modern Greek non-literal use of *κάθομαι*. The books should well serve the purpose for which they are intended.

F. H. M.

Περὶ τοῦ Γάμου. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν μελέτην τοῦ γάμου κατὰ τὴν Ἐκλογὴν τῶν Ἰσαύρων. By DEMETRIOS V. BOSDAS. Pp. 80. Athens. 1937.

In form this careful and well-documented study confines itself to that part of the *Ecloga* of Leo III, probably published in 726, which deals with marriage. In reality it goes further, and gives a good account of the place occupied by the *Ecloga* in the history of Greek law.

The *Ecloga* is of great importance as the first civil code published in the Greek language in the Byzantine Empire, though Justinian had found it advisable to use Greek for his *Novels*. It is also a manifestation of the innovating

policy of the Iconoclast Emperors, and marks the end of the stereotyped immobility of the Justinian legislation. It is influenced by the Greek customary law of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, and above all by Christianity. Though a good many of its provisions were upset by the reactionary legislation of the Macedonians, its influence was felt in the Turkish period, and has survived in the law of modern Greece.

A few of the more important features of the marriage code of the *Ecloga*, which illustrate its tendencies, may be specified. It gave equal validity to the written and unwritten types of marriage contract, the former of Egyptian origin, the latter Graeco-Roman and involving less expense. In both cases careful provision was made for the protection of the dowry of the wife and the πρόγεμος δωρεά of the husband, and for the fair apportionment of these between the surviving partner and children. Thus it marks a step forward in the history of married women's property. Survivals of the Mosaic law can be seen in the savage penalty of nose-slitting for the unfaithful fiancée and the adulterer and adulteress. But the most striking provisions are undoubtedly due to Christianity. The impediments to marriage are extended. The contracting parties must be Orthodox Christians, and marriage between blood-relations to the sixth degree is forbidden, as well as marriage between godfather and godmother of the same child. The minimum ages for marriage are the fifteenth year in the case of a male and the thirteenth in the case of a female. Marriage between freeman and slave is recognised, and this involves the emancipation of the slave.

Christian influence is especially evident in the regulations for divorce. Formally, adultery is the only approved cause. But practical considerations induced an extension to leprosy, plots against the life of the other by either partner, and the impotence of the husband. In view of recent legislation, it is noteworthy that incurable madness is specifically excluded as a ground for divorce, nor is divorce by mutual consent recognised.

Mr. Bosdas has done good service to students of Byzantine social life by this scholarly contribution to the Byzantine law of marriage.

F. H. M.

Vescovadi Cattolici della Grecia. III. Syros.

IV. Naxos. By GIORGIO HOFMANN. Pp. 157 + 211. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum. 1937-38.

Continuing his history of the Catholic sees in

Greece,¹ the author bases his account of that of Syra, founded about 1209, on documents ranging from 1624 to 1826. In 1624, before which little is known about this bishopric, the Orthodox numbered only 70 out of 3000 inhabitants, so that Syra was so predominantly Catholic that it was called 'the Pope's island.' The growth of the lower town was due to the War of Independence. The greatest Catholic bishop was Andrea Carga, hanged by the Turks in 1617: the Orthodox depended on the bishop of Andros. The relations between the two religions were normally good, but the author shows bias, when he approaches modern times. This monograph contains two illustrations, Syra in 1700 and the upper town, the Catholic stronghold, to-day, when the proportion between the two faiths is 11,000 Catholics to 16,000 Orthodox, the result of Catholic emigration in 1788 and later Orthodox immigration from Turkey.

The volume on Naxos covers the period from the Turkish conquest of the Duchy in 1566 to 1830, while the documents published range from 1601 to 1792. In 1563 there were 500 Catholics, in 1652 only 373, for even during the Latin domination they were only a small minority, just as in the first half century of Turkish rule there were only 70 Turks. After the Turkish capture of Rhodes the Archbishopric was transferred to Naxos, where an important Catholic Synod was held in 1634. The relations between the Catholics and the Orthodox were so cordial that the former were granted a chapel in the famous Hekatonpyliani Church of Paros, which island with Antiparos formed part of the Catholic see of Naxos. But the Russian occupation of 1770-74 caused difficulties, for the Albanian auxiliaries of the Russians threatened to prevent the Catholics from entering that church, and destroyed the Capuchin monastery of Paros, though the Russians respected the Catholic establishment in Naxos. Russian influence was supported by the Orthodox, while the Catholics looked to France as their protectress, till the French revolution caused the rebellion of Markos Politis against 'the Catholic barons,' and diminished the revenues of the religious orders. A brief 'epilogue' sums up the period 1830-1938, showing the decline of the Catholics, especially in the last half century to 70 in 1922, due to Turkish exactions followed by the War of Independence, mixed marriages and the lack of the usual Greek capacity for commerce in the Naxiote 'barons.' Hence,

¹ *JHS* liv, 236; lvi, 274.

in 1919 the Pope united the see of Naxos with Tenos, the Archbishop residing half the year in either island. Two illustrations, the cathedral in 1638 and Naxos to-day, adorn this monograph. For '1619' should be read 1669 on p. 37.

W. MILLER.

Ἀνδρέου Μ. Ἀνδρεάδου Ἔργα. I. Ἑλληνικὴ Οἰκονομικὴ καὶ δημοσιονομικὴ ἱστορία. Published by the Law Faculty of the University of Athens, edited by K. CH. BARBARESOS, G. A. PETROPOULOS and I. D. PINTOS. Pp. 790. Athens, 1938.

This first of three volumes, reprinting addresses and articles in Greek, French, English and Italian periodicals, by the late Professor Andreades,¹ so long intellectual liaison officer between Britain and Greece, contains a brief biographical introduction and 38 studies of the financial systems of Ancient, Hellenistic, Byzantine, Turkish and Modern Greece, the last three periods occupying half of this large volume. Beginning with 'the financial theories of Xenophon and Aristotle,' it describes 'the finance of tyrant governments in ancient Greece,' 'the death of Sparta and its demographic causes,' 'the capital levy in ancient Athens,' 'the budget of Alexander the Great,' that of the Byzantine Empire and its civil service, 'the Universities of Constantinople and their public endowments,' 'the financial administration of Greece under Turkish domination,' and that of Ali Pasha and Capo d'Istria. Besides a study of Benjamin of Tudela, there are three articles about the Jews in the Byzantine Empire and in Crete before the Venetian period, and the volume ends with 'the Union of the Ionian Islands and the administration of the British Protectorate.' Throughout, the writer's statements and conclusions are based upon wide research, enlightened by his personal experience of statesmen and affairs, for he was both a scholar and a man of the world. The book contains an excellent portrait.

W. M.

Ἡ στρατιωτικὴ ὀργάνωσις τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου. By GENERAL N. KALOMENOPoulos. Pp. 319. Athens, 1937.

The author complains that foreign military historians have neglected the Byzantine period, although he publishes a chapter on 'the military

literature of the Byzantines,' upon which his work is largely based. After a general survey of the composition of the Byzantine army, he describes its arms and uniforms, the moral forces animating it, its training and order of battle, its administration and the system of defending the Empire's frontiers in Europe, Asia Minor, Egypt, Libya and the Crimea, not forgetting diplomacy, in which the Byzantines were masters. There is also a chapter on communications, including 'telegraphy' by beacons, which Constantine Manasses called 'the treasure of the Romans,' and enabled news from Tarsus to reach Constantinople within an hour. Another is devoted to 'Greek fire,' which he considers to have been the army's most powerful weapon. Just as Gibbon found his service in the Hampshire militia useful to the historian of the Roman legions, so General Kalomenopoulos has evidently been aided in his Byzantine studies by his practical experience as aide-de-camp of General Bordeaux during the Great War, while the frequent references to Byzantine legal, as well as historical and tactical, works, show his scholarly research. He concludes that the fall of the Byzantine Empire was not due to military slackness or lack of generalship, but to those internal disputes which were the curse of ancient Greece, brought on the catastrophes of 1204 and 1453, and were often due to military leaders. So in modern Greece the army has caused every revolution.

W. M.

Ἡ διπλωματία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου. By General N. KALOMENOPoulos. Pp. 128. Athens: Blastou, 1938.

Continuing his Byzantine studies, the author introduces this monograph by the remark, that 'foreign policy and military organisation are two things bound together,' so that this monograph forms the natural sequel of his former treatise. He defines Byzantine diplomacy as a system of *divide et impera*, Danegeld, the bestowal of titles, and matrimonial alliances. Of this last there are several examples in Serbian mediaeval history. There were no permanent embassies or legations; like our Henry VII, the Byzantine emperors preferred to send special envoys, whenever occasion arose. Etiquette was strict, and the forms of addressing foreign potentates varied according to the status of each. After a general summary, the book deals with Byzantine relations with Bulgarians, Russians, Germans, Italians and Turks separately. The last chapter, which was to have included the French and English,

¹ *JHS* lvi. 276.

shows signs of compulsory abridgement, for it ends abruptly. There is a comparison between the diplomatic situation of Hellenism then and now, the difference being that 'then we Greeks alone faced the dangers threatening us, whereas to-day there are strong European powers, whose interest it is that our small state shall not be enslaved.' The possible danger arising from the 'Serbian free zone' at Salonika is illustrated by similar Byzantine concessions to Italian Republics.

W. M.

APOLOGY

An ill-worded sentence in my review of Drerup's *Der homerische Appollonhymnos* in the last number of this *Journal* (p. 121) has induced Professor Dornseiff to think that I was ranking him with Ruhnken and Jacoby as a dissector of the hymn. Nothing could have been further from my intention. Professor Dornseiff is an unitarian, in the Homeric Hymn and Theognis too, as his published works show. I hope he will accept this apology.

T. W. A.

CORRECTION

My attention has been called to a passage in a review by me on p. 104 of this *Journal*. The

review was of the book entitled 'The Praxiteles Marble Group at Olympia' by O. Antonsson. I there stated that the author of the book was 'working under the auspices of Prof. Persson and Dr. Kjellberg.'

I am informed by friends of the late Prof. Kjellberg that that scholar disapproved of the views of Mr. Antonsson as much as I do myself, and that he criticised it in print most drastically. These criticisms I have since seen. I am consequently gratified that our views agree. And I am further informed that 'this work was never written under the direction of Professor Kjellberg.' I am equally glad to know this.

My original mention of Dr. Kjellberg was based upon the statement on p. 13 of Mr. Antonsson's work which reads:

'I am also sincerely grateful . . . to Docent Ernst Kjellberg and Docent Ake Akerstrom for their active participation in my investigations in the Olympia Museum and in other ways.'

I think I may be pardoned for assuming that this 'active participation' was of an approving and not of a hostile, nature. Apparently I was mistaken. Mr. Antonsson should have made this disapproval clear, or else not have mentioned Dr. Kjellberg at all.

STANLEY CASSON.

INDEX TO VOLUME LVIII

I.—GENERAL

A

ADONIA, festival, 180, 183, 192
 Adonis and Aphrodite, 194, 198, 200
 Adonis-hymn, 201, 202
 Aeschylus, treatment of Prometheus, 51; sym-
 bolical art of, 52
 Aetna, coin of, 242, 245
 Agio Gala, pottery from, 231
 Agis, relations with Alcibiades, 34, 38
 Ahriman, hostile deity, 52
 Aidoion vases, 42, 46
 Alabastra, from al Mina, 141, 155
 Alcibiades, ambitions of, 39; character, 31, 32;
 at Sparta, 33 ff.; Spartan suspicion of, 39
 Alexandria, plan, 192; population, 191; site,
 191
 Alkimachos, inscription of, 217
 Alkisthenes of Sybaris, 206, 214, 215
 Al Mina, Sueidia, alabastra, 141, 155; amulets,
 157; building materials used at, 10; coins
 from, 22, 26, 140, 142, 150; excavations, 1 ff.,
 133 ff.; houses, 133 ff.; pottery, *see* Vases;
 scarabs, 161; seals, 160; site, 4, 16; terra-
 cottas, 163 ff.
 Altar, painted, from Karphi, 236
 Altavilla Silentina, tombs and vases from, 250
 Amphilocus, 30
 Amphipolis, lion of, 229
 Amulets, from al Mina, 157
 Anavysos, kouros from, 217
 Antheia, excavations, 224
 Apelles, friend of Philip V, 65
 Apulia, excavations, 250
 Arbour, rustic, 195
 Archelaus, honoured by Athens, 37
 Arenosola, necropolis, 251
 Arsinoe, tableau of, 193 ff.
 Aryballi, Attic, 24, 141, 142
 Astividhero, finds at, 234
 Athens, Archaeological Society Centenary, 254;
 Constitution, 177; Epigraphy, 69 ff, 217;
 Excavations—Acropolis, 219, N. Slope, 219,
 E. Slope, 221, dump, 221; Agora, 219;
 Erechtheum, 221; Kerameikos, 221; Klep-
 sydra, 219; Museums—Acropolis, bases, 217
 Attica, excavations, 217
 Aversa, tombs and vases, 250
 Ayios Philon, basilican church, 238

B

BASIT, modern site of Posidium, 3, 28
 Berlin, foundry vase in, 94; plastic vases in, 41,
 42
 Boston, plastic vases in, 42; terra-cotta Erotes
 in, 195
 Brasidas, exploits of, 36

British Museum, terra-cottas in, 185, 187; plastic
 vases in, 41, 42
 Bronzes, al Mina, 163 ff.; Chatsworth Apollo,
 90 ff., 255; early Greek, 94; goat from Ithaca,
 225; group from Samos, 230; statuettes, 49

C

CAERE, Greek workshops at, 48
 Calabria, excavations, 250
 Campania, excavations, 250 ff.
 Castellace, iron-age tombs, 250
 Catana, coins of, 242
 Catania, Greek theatre at, 247
 Chalcidian vases, 48, 49
 Chatsworth, Head of Apollo at, 90 ff., 255
 Clan, totemic, 173
 Cleisthenes, champion of democracy, 177; re-
 forms of, 172
 Coffin-graves, stone, 155 ff.
 Coins, of Aetna, 242; from al Mina, 22, 26, 140,
 142, 150; of Athens, 96; Catana, 242;
 Corinth, 96; Naxos, 241; Olynthus, 228;
 Syracuse, 240
 Comiso, finds at, 247
 Copenhagen, marble head in, 241; plastic vases
 in, 43
 Corinth, *see* Coins, Vases
 Corneto, r.f. cup in, 215
 Couch of Adonis, 194, 196
 Curium, excavations, 238

D

DAMARETEION, 242, 243
 Damastium, mines at, 96
 Delphi, excavations, 226
 Demetrius, quarrel with Perseus, 63
 Diokleidas, improvidence of, 203
 Dionysius, lover of textiles, 205; tragedies of, 206

E

ELEUSIS, excavations, 222
 Endius, intrigues with Alcibiades, 38, 39
 Erotes, from Myrina, 195
 Eupatridai, 176
 Evenor, sculptor, 217

F

FIBULAE, types of, from al Mina, 138
 Florence, plastic vase in, 41
 Fresco, Etruscan, 208; Pompeian, 199
 Frignano, tombs and vases, 250

G

GANYMEDE, 196
 Gennetai, 171, 173
 Geraki, basilica at, 224

H

- HARES, plastic vases in shape of, 43, 48
 Hekatompedon-lists, 69 ff.
 Hephaistia, theatre, excavations at, 231
 Heraclea, 35, 37
 Heraeum, Lucanian, excavations, 251; Samiano excavations, 230
 Himation, 185; Sybarite, 205 ff.
 Hipponion, walls of, 250
 Houses at al Mina, 133 ff.; at Olynthus, 227; Syracuse, 247

I

- INSCRIPTIONS, from Acropolis, 217; al Mina, 135, 140, 163, 164; coins, 245; Decleia, 179; on himation, 208; Minoan, from Kythera, 256; on lamp from Lasithi, 233; from Olynthus, 228; *IG II²*, 1370 + 1371 + 1384 + 1503, pp. 78-82; 1382, pp. 76 f.; 1383, pp. 74-76; 1385, p. 87; 1390, pp. 87, 88; 1419, pp. 97, 98; 1469, p. 98; 1517, p. 98
 Inventories, Attic, 97
 Ionia, plastic vases from, 45
 Isagoras, representing the oligarchy, 177
 Ithaca, excavations, 225

J

- JEWISH MUSEUM, London, medallion in, 255

K

- KALAMITSA, excavations, 229
 Kasios, Mt., 2, 3, 26, 29, 30
 Kasos, Greek hero, 30
 Kavalla, pottery from, 229
 Kerameikos, excavations, 221
 Khirokitia, neolithic settlement, 237
 Klepsydra, excavations, 219
 Knossos, excavations, 232
 Krisa, excavations, 226
 Kypria, on vases, 208, 215
 Kythera, Minoan inscription from, 256

L

- LAMPS, Attic, from al Mina, 24, 139, 140; Syrian, from al Mina, 24, 140; from Lasithi, 233
 Lasithi, excavations, 233
 Lecce, Messapian tombs, 250
 Lekythi, Attic b.f., 256; local, from al Mina, 26, 134, 137, 139 ff.
 Lemnos, excavations, 231
 Leotychidas, 34
 Leporano, neolithic settlement, 250
 Lindos, plastic vase from, 255
 Livy and Polybius, 61
 Lucania, excavations, 250
 Lysander, 34

M

- MACEDONIA, excavations, 229
 Maoris, social organisations of, 174
 Masks, grotesque, 157; terra-cotta, 227
 Medallion, gold, Jewish, 255
 Mercury, found at al Mina, 24
 Misogolas, 78
 Mosaic, Roman from Knossos, 232
 Munich, reliefs in, 187, 209

N

- NAPLES, Apulian amphora in, 195; Greek walls of, 250
 Naxos, excavations, 231; in Sicily, coins of, 241
 Nea Anchialos, excavations, 227
 Necklace, from al Mina, 24, 140, 166
 New York, plastic vases in, 42
 Nicander of Trichorium, 65
 Nicopolis, excavations, 226

O

- OLYMPIA, excavations, 222; Stadion, 223; Echo Stoa, 224; South Stoa, 224
 Olynthus, excavations, 227
 Opisthodomos-lists, chronological order of, 73
 Orgeones, 178
 Orifices of plastic vases, 46
 Owl, as coin-type, 96; vase-form, 46

P

- PAÄPIS, 75
 Palatitsa, Hellenistic tombs at, 229
 Palma Montechiaro, xoana from, 247
 Paris, plastic vases in Louvre, 43, 44
 Parthenon-lists, chronological order of, 73
 Perdiccas, death of, 36
 Persepolis, building of, 216; on himation, 209, 215
 Perseus, quarrel with Demetrius, 63
 Perspective in ancient art, 212
 Philip V, of Macedon, 55, 60, 63
 Philippi, excavations, 229
 Philocles, friend of Philip V, 65
 Phratry, membership of, 178
 Phylarchus, criticised by Polybius, 57, 64
 Polis, finds at, 226
 Polybius and tragedy, 56
 Posidium, identified as Basit, 3; as al Mina, 28
 Prometheus, 52
Prometheus Vincitus, 51

R

- REGGIO Calabria, walls of, 250
 Reliefs, *see* Sculpture
 Repetition in Etruscan art, 215
 Rome, Villa Giulia, plastic vase in, 44

S

- SABOUNI, finds at, 8, 21, 30
 S. Antimo, tombs and vases, 250
 Samian Heraeum, excavations, 230
 Sand-box process, 90
 Scarabs, from al Mina, 155, 161
 Sculpture, bone statuettes from al Mina, 165, 167; bronze head of Apollo, 90 ff.; Lime-stone — head of Herakles from Acropolis, 221; from al Mina, 20, 136, 144, 164, 167, 168; archaic stele from Kerameikos, 222; metopes from Lucanian Heraeum, 251 ff.; Marble — fragment from al Mina, 166; head of city-goddess from al Mina, 26, 135; psephesina relief in Athens, 216; kouros from Anavysos, 217; relief in British Museum, 200; head in Copenhagen, 241; reliefs in Munich, 187, 209; Naxian kore, 231; head from Parthenon, 217; Wooden xoana, 247

Seals, conical, 160; cylinder, 161; stone, 160
 Selinunte, excavations, 249
 Sicily, excavations, 247
 Sicyon, excavations, 224
 Siphnos, excavations, 231; gems from, 232
 Solon, civil reforms, 176; monetary reforms, 96
 Sparta, Alcibiades at, 30
 Spetsai, Christian churches at, 225
 Susa, pictured on himation, 209, 215
 Sybaris, cities with name of, 206, 215
 Syracuse, Castle Euryalus, 247; coins of, 240;
 temple of Apollo, 247; tombs at, 247

T

TAORMINA, theatre at, 247
 Tapestries, at Adonia festival, 198; Greek, 205,
 210
 Terra-cottas, from al Mina, 163 ff.; in British
 Museum, 185, 187; Cypriote, 19; from
 Lasithi, 233; from Myrina, 195; from Olyn-
 thus, 228
 Theoxena, 62
 Thiasos = phratry-member, 178
 Tholos, in Athenian agora, 218
 Timaea, wife of Agis, 34
 Tindari, theatre at, 247
 Totemic system at Athens, 174
 Town-pictures, 211
Traditiones, 70, 74
 Tris Langadas, excavations, 225
 Tyche, 58, 62, 63

V

VASE-PAINTERS, Brygos, 221; Chariot, 257;
 Diosphos, 258; Epictetus, 245; Euthymides,
 245; Exekias, 219; Olto, 215; Paideros, 219;
 Phanyllis, 257, 259; Priapos, 49; Sappho,
 258, 259; Syleus, 22, 146; Theseus, 257
 Vases, at Sabouni, 9, 21; protoattic, from

Agora, 219; Attic black-figured from Acro-
 polis, 219, 221; from Comiso, 250; François
 vase, 215; lekythi, 139, 256 ff.; Panathenaic
 amphorae from al Mina, 22; Attic red-
 figured, 49; from al Mina, 22, 140, 146, 148,
 150; foundry vase in Berlin, 94; cup in
 Corneto, 215; Kerch, from al Mina, 135;
 pelike in Leningrad, 208; from Olynthus, 228;
 Apulian red-figure amphora in Naples, 195;
 Campanian red-figure, 250; Paestan red-
 figure and applied red, 251; Caeretan hydriae,
 47 ff.; Chalcidian, 48, 49; Protocorinthian
 oenochoe from Ithaca, 225; Corinthian, 16,
 20, 144, 247; Cypriote, 16, 144, 154, 238;
 Fikellura, 219; Geometric, 16, 221, 225, 231,
 236; Local vases from al Mina, 20, 26, 134,
 137, 139 ff., 152; Rhodian, 16, 18, 20, 144,
 154, 247; "Phoenician," 22, 156
 Vatican, Ganymede group in, 196; plastic
 vases in, 42, 43, 44
 Vienna, plastic vase in, 44
 Vounous, excavations, 238

W

WALL-PAINTING, at Olynthus, 227; *see* Fresco
 Weights, from al Mina, 24
 Wool, price in Egypt, 203
 Würzburg, plastic vase in, 42

X

XOANA, wooden, from Palma Montechiaro, 247

Y

YUSUF, Sheikh, tomb of, 5, 8, 142

Z

ZEUS, Kasios, 26; Polieus, 72; in *Prom. Vinc.*,
 51

II.—GREEK INDEX

*Αλκισθένης, 205, 214
 ἀμπέχονον, 184, 185, 187
 ἀρχηγός, 255

βασίλῃες, 176

γεννῆται, 171
 γένος, 172

δεικτήριον, 182
 δεξιώσεις, 209

ἐκφράσεις, 206
 ἐμπερόναμα, 186
 ἔμφυλος, 176
 ἐνδινεῖν, 199
 ἐπέτεια, 72, 77
 ἔταιρεία, 176
 εὐπατρίδης, 175
 Εὐτρέφης, 74

θερίστριον, 185, 186
 θολία, 187, 188

ῥορός, 218

ἵππος πολεμιστής, 189, 192

καρχήσιον, 72
 καταχύσματα, 175, 200
 κῆποι *Αδωνίδος, 183, 194
 κλίνη, 184, 198, 200
 κλισμός, 198, 199
 κρηπίς, 190, 191
 κυνάδες, 203

λαμβάνειν, 203
 Λοχιάς, 192

μεταβολή, 55

οἶκος, 249
 ὁμογάλακτες, 178
 ὄπαιον, 249
 ὄργεῶνες, 178

περονατρίς, 184, 186, 187

πήρα, 203
 πινωνῶς, 255
 πυργωτός, 214

ρύμος, 78, 80

στέφανος, 74, 81, 87, 182
 στεφάνωσις, 209, 215

τέθριππα, 189
 τραγικός, 58, 59

ὑποδίφθερα, 203

φιάλαι, 74, 75

χιτών, 186
 χλαμύς, 190, 191
 χορδαί, 182, 194
 χρυσίς, 72, 74, 75, 86

Aristotle, *Αθ. Πολ. 16, p. 172; 20, p. 177
 —, *de miris auscult.* 838a, p. 205
 Athenaeus, v. 196 f., p. 198; 198a, p. 191;
 198d, p. 195; xii. 534b, p. 31; 541a, p. 205

Bion, *Epit. Ad.* 13, p. 199

Harpocration, p. 178

Philochorus, p. 178
 Photius, p. 189
 Plutarch, *Ant.* 54, p. 190
 —, *Mor.* 760b, p. 190
 Pollux, 10. 127, p. 187
 Polybius, ii. 16. 14, p. 56; 56. 8, p. 57; 56. 3,
 56. 13, p. 56; 58. 12, 61. 1, p. 56; iii. 47. 9,
 p. 57; xii. 25b. 4, p. 64; xv. 28. 4, p. 192;
 30. 4, p. 193; xxiii. 10. 16, p. 64

Stasinus, p. 61
 Strabo, 17. 793, p. 192; 794, p. 200

Theocritus, iii. 46, p. 199; xiv. 65, p. 190;
 xv, 184 ff.
 Thucydides, vi. 92. 5, p. 33

III.—BOOKS NOTICED

- ALCAEUS, *see* Reinach (Th.)
Altertümer von Pergamon, *see* Boehringer (E.)
Ambix, 289
 Ἀνδρεάδου (A. M.), Ἔργα I, 292
 Antonsson (O.), *The Praxiteles Marble Group at Olympia*, 104, 293
 Ἀργέντη, *see* Περιοδικόν
 Aristotle, *see* Menardos (S.)
- Bengston (H.), *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit*, 118
 Béquignon (Y.), *La Vallée du Spercheios*, 277
 —, *Recherches archéologiques à Phères*, 278
 Bickerman (E.), *Institutions des Séleucides*, 264
 Blom (J. W. S.), *De typische getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos: I Triaden, Hebdomaden en Enneaden*, 122
 Blümel (C.), *Römischer Kopien griechischer Skulpturen*, 273
 Boehringer (E.) and Krauss (F.), *Altertümer von Pergamon, IX—Das Temenos für den Herrscherkult*, 103
 — and von Szalay (A.), *Altertümer von Pergamon, X—Die hellenistischen Arsenalen*, 103
 Bonner (R. J.) and Smith (G.), *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, vol. ii, 261
 Bosdas (D. V.), *Περὶ τοῦ Γάμου*, 290
 Brommer (F.), *Satyroi*, 105
- Cameron (A.), *see* Cox (C. W. M.)
 Capps (E.), *Classical Studies presented to*, 122
 Cloché (P.), *Démosthènes et la fin de la Démocratie athénienne*, 118
 Collart (P.), *Philippe, Ville de Macédoine*, 277
 Colwell (E. C.), *see* Goodspeed (E. J.)
Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, *see* Laurenzi (L.) and Robinson (D. M.)
 Cox (C. W. M.) and Cameron (A.), *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, vol. v, 111
 Crowfoot (J. W.), *Churches at Bosra and Samaria-Sebaste*, 287
 Cumont (F.), *L'Égypte des Astrologues*, 120
 Curtius (L.), *Die klassische Kunst Griechenlands*, 279
- Dascalakis (A.), *Rhigas Velestinlis—La Revolution française*, 129
 —, *Les Oeuvres de Rhigas Velestinlis*, 129
 Delta (S.), Ἐπικτήτου Ἐγχειρίδιον κ.τ.λ., 290
 Deubner (L.), *Iamblich de Vita Pythagorica Liber*, 285
 Diels (H.) ed. Kranz (W.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, III, 283
 Dikaio (P.), Guest (E. M.) and Seton-Williams (V.), *The Excavations at Erimi, 1933–35: Final Report*, 100
 Dohrn (T.), *Die schwarzfigurigen etruskischen Vasen*, 268
 Dow (S.), *Prytaneis*, 109
 Drerup (E.), *Der homerische Apollonhymnos*, 121, 293
- Ducati (P.), *Le Pitture delle Tombe delle Leonesse e dei Vasi dipinti*, 269
 Dudley (D. R.), *A History of Cynicism*, 119
 Dutoit (E.), *Le Thème de l'Adynaton dans la Poésie antique*, 123
- Epictetus, *see* Delta (S.)
 Euripides, *see* King (F. W.), Platnauer (M.) and Spranger (J. A.)
- Flacelière (R.), *Plutarque—Sur les Oracles de la Pythie*, 284
 Freeman (S. E.), *see* Robinson (D. M.)
- Gauss (H.), *Plato's Conception of Philosophy*, 119
 Georgiades (K. P.), Ἡ Καταγωγή τῶν Κυπρίων, 101
 Georgiev (V.), *Die Träger der Kretisch-Mykenischen Kultur, I*, 260
 Gomme (A. W.), *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, 117
 Goodspeed (E. J.) and Colwell (E. C.), *A Greek Papyrus Reader*, 114
 Guest (E. M.), *see* Dikaio (P.)
 Gunnis (R.), *see* Rice (D. T.)
- Hatzfeld (J.), *Xenophon—Helleniques I–III*, 284
 Hege (W.) and Rodenwaldt (G.), *Olympia*, 280
 Heidel (W. A.), *The Frame of ancient Greek Maps*, 279
 Heliodorus, *see* Rattenbury (R. M.)
 Herodotus, *see* Powell (J. E.)
 Hofman (G.), *Vescovadi cattolici della Grecia, III. Syros, IV. Naxos*, 291
 Homann-Wedeking (E.), *Archaische Vasenornamentik*, 266
 Homer, *see* Humbert (J.)
 Humbert (J.), *Homère—Hymnes*, 284
 Hussey (J. M.), *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire*, 126
- Iamblichus, *see* Deubner (L.)
- Jaeger (W.), *Demosthenes*, 263
- Kalomenopoulos (N.), Ἡ διπλωματία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου, 292
 —, Ἡ στρατιωτικὴ ὀργάνωσις τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου, 292
 Kaschnitz-Weinberg (G.), *Sculture del Magazzino del Museo Gregoriano*, 274
 Kase (E. H.), *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, vol. ii, 114
 Kautsch (R.), *Kapitellstudien*, 123
 King (F. W.), *Euripides—Hecuba*, 286
 Kinyras Society, Διαλέξεις περὶ τῶν κορυφαίων Κυπρίων Φιλοσόφων καὶ Πεζογράφων, 131
 Klumbach (H.), *Tarentiner Grabkunst*, 270
 Kortenbeutel (H.), *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin—Griechische Urkunden, IX*, 112

- Kranz (W.), *see* Diels (H.)
 Krauss (F.), *see* Boehringer (E.)
 Kroymann (J.), *Sparta und Messenien*, 260
 Kyrou (A. A.), Οἱ Ἕλληνες τῆς Ἀναγεννήσεως καὶ ὁ Δομήνικος Θεοτοκόπουλος, 129
 Lake (K.), *Studies presented to*, 122
 Launey (M.), *see* Roussel (P.)
 Laurenzi (L.), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Italia 12 = Bologna 3*, 107
 Lehmann (H.), *Argolis. vol. i*, 103
 Livingstone (R. W.), *Portrait of Socrates*, 283
 Lumb (T. W.), *see* Rattenbury (R. M.)
 MacGregor (M.), *Studies and Diversions in Greek Literature*, 281
 Mackenzie (C.), *Pericles*, 261
 Mayser (E.), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri, Bd. I, Teil ii—Flexionslehre*, 114
 Menardos (S.) and Sykoutris (I.), Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ Ποιητικῆς, 289
 Merritt (B. D.), *Documents on Athenian Tribute*, 108
 Michigan Papyri, *see* Winter (J. G.) and Youtie (H. C.)
 Millet (G.), *see* Strzygowski (J.)
 Murray (G.), *Essays in Honour of*, 121
 Norvin (W.), *Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Gorgian Commentarii*, 286
 Olympiodorus, *see* Norvin (W.)
 Pace (B.), *Arte e Civiltà della Sicilia antica, II*, 271
 Pearl (O. M.), *see* Youtie (H. C.)
 Peiraeus Harbour Organisation, Χρονικά τοῦ "Ο. Α. Π.", 131
 Περιοδικὸν τοῦ ἐν Χίῳ Συλλόγου Ἀργέντη, 289
 Phteres (G.), Ἡ ἠρυλικὴ ζωὴ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Βουρβάκη, 130
 Platnauer (M.), *Euripides—Iphigenia in Tauris*, 286
 Plutarch, *see* Flacelière (R.)
 Pottier (E.), *Recueil*, 105
 Powell (J. E.), *Lexicon to Herodotus*, 284
 Puech (A.), *see* Reinach (Th.)
 Rattenbury (R. M.) and Lumb (T. W.), *Héliodore—Les Éthiopiennes*, 284
 Reinach (Th.) and Puech (A.), *Alcée : Sappho*, 121
 Rice (D. Talbot), Gunnis (R.) and Rice (T. T.), *The Icons of Cyprus*, 128
 Rice (T. T.), *see* Rice (D. Talbot)
 Richter (G. M. A.), *Etruscan terra-cotta Warriors*, 104
 Robinson (D. M.) and Freeman (S. E.), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, U.S.A. 6 = Baltimore 2*, 267
 Robinson (E. S. G.), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, II—III*, 280
 Rodenwaldt (G.), *see* Hege (W.)
 Rodgers (W. L.), *Greek and Roman Naval Warfare*, 116
 Roussel (P.) and Launey (M.), *Inscriptions de Délos*, 281
 Sappho, *see* Reinach (Th.)
 Savadjian (L.), *Bibliographie Balkanique 1937*, 289
 Schaeffer (C. M. A.), *Missions en Chypre 1932–35*, 100
 Schuman (V. B.), *see* Youtie (H. C.)
 Segall (B.), *Museum Benaki—Katalog der Goldschmiedarbeiten*, 276
 Seton-Williams (V.), *see* Dikaos (P.)
 Smith (G.), *see* Bonner (R. J.)
 Snaith (R. E.), *Xenophon—Anabasis II*, 286
 Spaulding (O. L.), *Pen and Sword in Greece and Rome*, 116
 Spranger (J. A.), *Euripidis quae in Codice Hierosolymitano rescripto Patriarchalis bibliothecae xxxvi servantur*, 120
 Stein (A.), *Archaeological Researches in N.W. India and S.E. Iran*, 102
 Stillwell (R.), *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, II*, 288
 Strzygowski (J.) and Millet (G.), *L'ancien Art chrétien de Syrie*, 124
 Sykoutris (I.), *see* Menardos (S.)
 Szalay (A. von), *see* Boehringer (E.)
 Trendall (A. D.), *Frühitaliotische Vasen*, 269
 Waterman (L.), *Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Sepphoris*, 287
 Webster (T. B. L.), *Introduction to Sophocles*, 281
 Wellesz (E.), *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta, I. Hymnen des Sticherarium für September*, 127
 Wikén (E.), *Die Kunde der Hellenen*, 115
 Winter (J. G.), *Michigan Papyri III*, 113
 Woodward (J. M.), *Perseus*, 105
 Xenophon, *see* Hatzfeld (J.) and Snaith (R. E.)
 Youtie (H. C.), Schuman (V. B.) and Pearl (O. M.), *Michigan Papyri, IV i—Tax Rolls from Karanis*, 113

SUPPLEMENT NO. XV
TO THE
SUBJECT CATALOGUE † OF THE JOINT LIBRARY
APPARATUS, HISTORY OF STUDIES, ETC.

Periodicals.

- Ambix.** The Journal of the Society for the study of Alchemy and early Chemistry. From vol. i (1937).
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. *In Progress.*
- Archaeologia.** Vols. 65-70, 81, 83, 86.
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{3}{4}$ in. Oxford. 1913-37.
- Bucharest.** Bucureşti. Revista muzeului şi pinacotecei municipale Bucureşti. From vol. i, 2 (1935).
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. Bucharest. *In Progress.*
- Classica et Mediaevalia.** Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire. From vol. i (1938).
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. Copenhagen. *In Progress.*
- Congress of Archaeological Societies** in union with the Society of Antiquaries of London. The Year's Work in Archaeology, 1921. Continued as Report of the Earthworks Committee 1922-30. Continued as Report of the Congress and of the Research Committee for the year. From 1930 (38th Congress).
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. *In Progress.*
- Constantinople.** Annuaire des Musées d'Istanbul, No. 2.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 94. Constantinople. 1937.
- Hermes, Einzelschriften.**
4. Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellung im frühgriechischen Denken. By O. Becker. 1937.
5. Euripides Alexandros und andere Strassburger Papyri mit fragmenten griechischer Dichter. By B. Snell. 1937.
- Hesperia.** Supplement, 1. Prytaneis. A study of the inscriptions honoring the Athenian Councillors. By S. Dow.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 258. Athens. 1937.
- Klio, Beihefte.**
38. (N.S. 25). Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen. By A. Jirku. 1937.
39. (N.S. 26). Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus. By A. Heuss. 1937.
- Leningrad.** Sovietskaja Arkheologiya. From vol. i (1936).
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. Moscow: Leningrad. *In Progress.*
- Malta.** Annual report on the working of the Museum department. From 1925-26. $12 \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ in. Malta. *In Progress.*
- Minerva.** Jahrbuch der gelehrten Welt.
 $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. Berlin and Leipsic.
32. Jahrgang. Abt. Universitäten und Fachhochschulen.
pp. xxxiv + 2201. 1936.

* Indicates an additional copy.

† The Catalogue (published 1924) is sold to members at the reduced price of 7s. 6d. (by post 8s. 6d.).

This and other supplements are sold at 6d. each.

Address: The Assistant Librarian, Hellenic and Roman Societies, 50 Bedford Square, W.C.1.

32. Jahrgang. Abt. Forschungsinstitute, Observatorien, Bibliotheken, Archive, Museen, Kommissionen, Gesellschaften. pp. xii + 1765. 1937.
- Morgenland.** Heft 28. Orientalische Stimmen zur Erlösungsgedanken. Ed. F. Taeschner. 1936.
29. Morgenlandische Spruchweisheit. By E. Littmann. 1937.
- Moscow.** Revue d'histoire ancienne. From vol. i, 2 (1938). 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ × 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ in. Moscow. *In Progress.*
- Palermo.** Annali del seminario giuridico della R. Università di Palermo. From 15 (1936). 10 × 7 in. Cortona. *In Progress.*
- Philologus Supplementbände.**
- 29 (4). Der lysianische Epitaphios. Von J. Walz. 1936.
- 30 (1). Die Ôikeiosis-Lehre Theophrasts. Von F. Dirlmeier. 1937.
- 30 (2). ΑΙΔΩΣ und verwandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit. Von C. E. von Erffa. 1937.
- 30 (3). Über die philosophische Bedeutung von Platons Mythen. Von P. Stocklein. 1937.
- 30 (4). ΚΑΝΩΝ. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma). Von H. Oppel. 1937.
- 31 (1). Der Friedensgedanke in der antiken Welt. Von W. Nestle. 1938.
- Rhetorische Studien.**
19. Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren. By K. Jost. 1936.
20. Das attische Prozessverfahren in seiner Wirkung auf die Gerichtsrede. By F. Lamml. 1938.
- *Supplementary Volumes.*
1. Die ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ (Variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thukydides. By J. Ros. 1938.
- Essays, Studies, etc.*
- Heinze (R.)** Vom Geist des Romertums. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. v — 296. Leipsic and Berlin. 1938.
- Allen (G. W. G.) and Nash-Williams (V. E.)** Air-photography and archaeology. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 35. Cardiff. 1938.
- International conference on excavations.** Final Act. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 23. Paris. 1937.
- Institutions.*
- League of Nations.** Survey of the activities of the department of art, archaeology and ethnology. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 14. Paris. 1937.
- Rome.** Mostra Augustea della Romanità. Catalogo. 3rd edition. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxviii — 869. Rome. [1938.]
- London, University of.** Institute of Archaeology. First annual report, 1937. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 72. 1938.
- Biographies.*
- Gardner (P.)** HILL (G.) Percy Gardner, 1846–1937. [Proc. Brit. Acad. xxiii.] 10 × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 13. 1938.
- James (M. R.)** GASFILE (S.) Montague Rhodes James, O.M., 1862–1936. [Proc. Brit. Acad., xxii.] 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 18. [1937.]

- Mommsen (T.)** NACHMANSON (E.) Mommsen och Sverige några brev utgivna och Kommenterade. [Göteborgs Högskolas Arsskrift, xliii.]
 10×7 in. pp. 36. Gothenburg. 1937.
- Porson (R.)** CLARKE (M. L.) Richard Porson.
 8×5 in. pp. viii + 133. Cambridge. 1937.
- Cagnat (R.)** Mélanges. Recueil de mémoires concernant l'épigraphie et les antiquités romaines.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 452. Paris. 1912.
- Curtius (L.)** Corolla Ludwig Curtius zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht. 2 vols.
 $13\frac{3}{4} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 224; xv + 72 plates. Stuttgart. 1937.
- Desrousseaux (A.-M.)** Mélanges offerts à A.-M. Desrousseaux par ses amis et ses élèves.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xiii + 502. Paris. 1937.
- Lake (K.)** Quantulacumque. Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake by pupils, colleagues and friends.
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7$ in. pp. viii + 367. 1937.

GREEK AUTHORS

- Corpus medicorum graecorum.** Supplementum ii. Galeni de causis procatarteticis libellus a Nicolao Regino in sermonem latinum translatus. *Ed.* K. Bardong.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxxiv + 64. Leipsic and Berlin. 1937.
- Philosophi.** DIELS (H.) Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. 5th edition by W. Kranz. Vol. 3 (Index).
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 654. Berlin. 1937-8.
- Testament, New.** Acta Apostolorum. *Ed.* F. Blass.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. x, 334. Göttingen. 1895.
- Higham (T. F.) and Bowra (C. M.)** The Oxford Book of Greek verse in translation.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. cxii + 781. Oxford. 1938.
- Aeschylus.** Agamemnon. *Ed.* A. Y. Campbell.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxii + 126. 1936.
- Alcaeus and Sappho.** Text with French transl. by T. Reinach and A. Puech. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 338. Paris. 1937.
- * **Aristophanes.** Clouds. *Ed.* W. W. Merry.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 104. Oxford. 1889.
- Peace. *Ed.* F. A. Paley.
 $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 144. Cambridge. 1873.
- HUGILL (W. M.) The last appeal of Aristophanes.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 30. Toronto. 1937.
- * ——— MURRAY (G.) Aristophanes.
 $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. x + 268. Oxford. 1933.
- Aristotle.** The Nicomachean Ethics. Translated by F. H. Peters.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. xv + 359. 1898.
- * ——— The Nicomachean Ethics. With an Engl. transl. by H. Rackham [Loeb Class. Lib.].
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxvi + 650. 1926.
- STEWART (J. A.) Notes on the Nicomachean ethics of Aristotle. 2 vols.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 539; 475. Oxford. 1892.

- Aristotle.** The Organon, i. *Ed.* with Engl. transl. by H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick. [Loeb Class Lib.]
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. vii + 542. 1938.
- Parts of Animals. *Ed.* with Engl. transl. by A. L. Peck.
 Movements of Animals—Progression of Animals. *Ed.*
 with Engl. transl. by E. S. Forster. [Loeb Class Lib.]
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. vi + 556. 1937.
- Poetics. Text, with modern Greek transl. by S. Menardos;
 notes and introduction by J. Sykutris.
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 285. Athens. 1937.
- Politica. *Ed.* F. Susemihl.
 $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xliii + 368. Leipsic. 1894.
- Athenaeus.** The Deipnosophists. Vol. vi. *Ed.* with Engl. transl.
 by C. B. Gulick. [Loeb Class Lib.]
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 548. 1937.
- Callimachus.** DE COLA (M.) Callimaco e Ovidio.
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 131. Palermo. 1937.
- DIEHL (E.) Der Digressionsstil des Kallimachos. [Abh. d.
 Herder-Gesellschaft . . . zu Riga, v.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 28. Riga. 1937.
- ——— Hypomnema. De Callimachi librorum fati capitula
 selecta. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 172. Riga. 1937.
- Chariton.** De Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri
 octo. *Ed.* W. E. Blake.
 $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xx + 142. Oxford. 1938.
- Comnena (Anna).** Alexiade i–vi. Text and French transl. by
 B. Leib. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. clxxxii + [338]. Paris. 1937.
- * **Demosthenes.** De Corona. *Ed.* B. Drake.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxxv + 213. 1891.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus.** The Roman Antiquities. *Ed.* with
 Engl. transl. by E. Cary. In 7 vols. [Loeb Class Lib.]
 From vol. i (1937). $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. *In Progress.*
- Epictetus.** Ἐγχειρίδιον. M. AURELIUS. Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτόν. CLEAN-
 THES. Ὑμνος εἰς Δία. Translated into modern Greek
 by S. Delta.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 253. Athens. 1935.
- Αἱ κατ' Ἀρριανὸν Διατριβαί. Translated into modern Greek
 by S. Delta. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 340. Athens. 1937.
- Euripides.** Euripidis quae in codice Hierosolymitano rescripto
 patriarchalis bibliothecae xxxvi servantur. Album of
 photographs by J. A. Spranger.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 14\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. iv + 34 plates. Florence.
 1937.
- * ——— Alcestis. *Ed.* W. S. Hadley.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxiii + 159. Cambridge. 1896.
- Hecuba. *Ed.* F. W. King.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 162. 1938.
- * ——— Heracleidae. *Ed.* E. A. Beck.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 127. Cambridge. 1882.
- * ——— Hippolytus. *Ed.* W. S. Hadley.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 132. Cambridge. 1889.
- Medea. *Ed.* A. W. Verrall.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxxiii + 127. 1892.
- * ——— Iphigeneia at Aulis. *Ed.* C. E. S. Headlam.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxviii + 137. Cambridge. 1896.
- * ——— Iphigeneia in Tauris. *Ed.* E. B. England.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxxi + 260. 1899.
- Iphigenia in Tauris. *Ed.* M. Platnauer.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xix + 186. Oxford. 1938.

- Heliodorus.** Les Éthiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée) Tome ii. Text and French transl. by R. M. Rattenbury, T. W. Lumb and J. Maillon. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 328. Paris. 1938.
- GLAVA (Z. A.) A study of Heliodorus and his romance the Aethiopica. 9×6 in. pp. 20. New York. 1937.
- Herodotus.** POWELL (J. E.) A lexicon to Herodotus.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. x + 392. Cambridge. 1938.
- Homer.** ABRAMOWICZ (S.) Études sur les hymnes homériques.
 10×7 in. pp. 96. Vilna. 1937.
- DRERUP (E.) Der homerische Apollonhymnos; eine methodologische Studie. [Mnemos., 1937.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 54. Leyden. 1937.
- OIKONOMOS (P. N.) Ὀδυσσεύως Νόστος.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 49. Athens. 1937.
- SCHWYZER (E.) Ein altes Problem der homerischen Sprache. [Sitz-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1938, xii.]
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 14. Berlin. 1938.
- Iamblichus.** De vita Pythagorica liber. Ed. L. Deubner.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xx + 158. Leipsic. 1937.
- John (St.).** OLIVIER (A.) La clé de l'Apocalypse.
 $11\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 210. Paris. 1938.
- Josephus.** Vol. vi, Jewish Antiquities, Bks. ix–xi. Ed. with Engl. transl. by R. Marcus. [Loeb Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 532. 1937.
- Lucian.** Somnium, Charon, Piscator et de Luctu. Ed. W. E. Heitland.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xx + 148. Cambridge. 1877.
- Études sur Alexandre ou le faux prophète. By M. Caster.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. lx + 102. Paris. 1938.
- CASTER (M.) Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 412. Paris. 1937.
- Philo.** GOODENOUGH (E. R.) The politics of Philo Judaeus: practice and theory, with a general bibliography of Philo by H. L. Goodhart and E. R. Goodenough.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 348. New Haven, Conn. 1938.
- Plato.** Portrait of Socrates. Being the Apology, Crito and Phaedo in an Engl. transl. with introductions and notes by R. W. Livingstone.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. lvi + 200. Oxford. 1938.
- * ——— The Republic. Ed. J. Adam. 2 vols.
 $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 364; 532. Cambridge. 1926–29.
- CROSSMAN (R. H. S.) Plato to-day.
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 302. 1937.
- GAUSS (H.) Plato's conception of philosophy.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xxii + 272. 1937.
- VOURVERIS (K. I.) Αἱ ἱστορικαὶ γνώσεις τοῦ Πλάτωνος. Α'. Βαρβαρικά.
 10×7 in. pp. 160. Athens. 1938.
- ——— Platon und die Barbaren.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 24. Athens. 1938.
- Plotinus.** Ennéades, vi, 2. Text and French transl. by E. Bréhier. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 469. Paris. 1938.
- Schriften. Band iv. Die Schriften 39–45. German transl. by R. Harder.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. 202. Leipsic. 1937.

- Plotinus.** HENRY (P.) *Études plotiniennes, i. Les états du texte de Plotin.*
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxviii + 426. Brussels. 1938.
- Plutarch.** *Lives of the Gracchi.* Ed. G. E. Underhill.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xlvii + 108. Oxford. 1892.
- Polybius.** *Pagine scelte.* Ed. B. Lavagnini.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xix + 87. Turin. 1938.
- *Il libro secondo delle storie.* Ed. P. Treves.
 $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 302. Naples. 1938.
- Sophocles.** *Electra.* Ed. L. Campbell and E. Abbott.
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. viii + 124. Oxford. 1896.
- Theocritus.** *The Idylls.* Ed. with an introduction and notes by R. J. Cholmeley. New ed.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. viii + 449. 1930 (1919).
- Theophrastus.** STRÖMBERG (R.) *Theophrastea. Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung.*
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. pp. 234. Göteborg. 1937.
- Thucydides.** *Der grosse Krieg.* Selections translated into German by H. Weinstock.
 $7 \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxviii + 174. Stuttgart. 1938.
- Xenophon.** *Anabasis ii.* Ed. R. E. Snaith.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 134. 1938.

LATIN AUTHORS

- Apuleius.** RIEFSTAHL (H.) *Der Roman des Apuleius.* [Frankfurter Stud. 15.]
 $10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 133. Frankfurt a/M. 1938.
- Augustine.** MULDOWNNEY (M. S.) *Word-order in the works of St. Augustine.*
 9×6 in. pp. xxiv + 155. Washington. 1937.
- SCHIEMAN (M. B.) *The rare and late verbs in St. Augustine's De civitate Dei.*
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xvii + 85. Washington. 1938.
- Augustus.** NEWBY (J. D.) *A numismatic commentary on the Res Gestae of Augustus.*
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xvi + 117. Iowa. 1938.
- Caesar.** *Invasions of Britain.* Ed. R. C. Carrington.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 118. 1938.
- Cassiodorus.** BIETER (F. A.) *The Syntax of the cases and prepositions in Cassiodorus' Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita.*
 9×6 in. pp. xxi + 220. Washington, D.C. 1938.
- Celsus.** *De Medicina ii and iii.* Ed. with Engl. transl. by W. G. Spencer. 2 vols. [Loeb Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. lxxvii + 649. 1938.
- Cicero.** *Discours. Tome xii. Pour le poète Archias.* Text and French transl. by F. Gaffiot. *Pour L. Flaccus.* Text and French transl. by A. Boulanger. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 219. Paris. 1938.
- *In Catilinam i-iv, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco.* With an Engl. transl. by L. E. Lord. [Loeb Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 485. 1937.
- *The Orations against Catilina.* Ed. A. S. Wilkins.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxxix + 168. 1894.
- *Pro Marcello. Pro Ligario. Pro rege Deiotaro.* Ed. W. Y. Fausset. $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 47 + 61. Oxford. 1893.
- *Speeches for Marcellus and Ligarius.* Ed. J. Paterson.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 144. 1938.

- * **Cicero.** *Academica.* Ed. J. S. Reid.
 9 × 5½ in. pp. x + 371. 1885.
 —— Cicero in his letters. Ed. R. Y. Tyrrell.
 6½ × 4¼ in. pp. cxiii + 336. 1896.
 —— Life and letters; a new translation of the letters in Watson's
 selection, with historical and critical notes by G. E.
 Jeans. 7½ × 5 in. pp. xxiv + 434. 1914.
- Claudian.** MALCOVATI (E.) Un codice Pavese inedito del De
 raptu Proserpinae. [Rendiconti del R. Ist. Lombardo,
 lxxi, 1.] 9½ × 6¾ in. pp. 12. Milan. 1938.
- Ennius.** DRABKIN (N. L.) The *Medea Exul* of Ennius.
 9 × 6 in. pp. 94. Geneva, N.Y. 1937.
- Firmicus Maternus (J.)** De errore profanarum religionum. Ed.
 with French transl. by G. Heuten.
 9¾ × 6½ in. pp. 212. Brussels. 1938.
- Gregory.** NORBERG (D.) In Registrum Gregorii Magni studia
 critica. [Upps. Univ. Arsskr., 1937.]
 9½ × 6½ in. pp. xvi + 175. Uppsala. 1937.
- Horace.** The Odes, Carmen Seculare and Epodes. Ed. E. C.
 Wickham.
 6¾ × 4½ in. pp. xxxii + 175 + 348. Oxford.
 1891.
 —— Die Gedichte. Text and German verse transl. by R. Helm.
 7 × 4¼ in. pp. xxviii + 151. Stuttgart. 1938.
- * ——— The Epistles. Ed. A. S. Wilkins.
 6½ × 4¼ in. pp. xxxiii + 442. 1892.
- Perfidum ridens Venus. L'Ode iii. 27 di Orazio con versione
 ritmico ed esegesi. By C. Buscaroli.
 8¾ × 6½ in. pp. 76. Bologna. 1937.
- NYBAKKEN (O. E.) An analytical study of Horace's ideas.
 [Iowa Stud. class. Phil. 5.]
 10 × 6¾ in. pp. 124. Iowa City. 1937.
- LISBON. Biblioteca Nacional. Exposição Horaciana,
 catálogo.
 9 × 6¼ in. pp. xii + 358. Lisbon. 1937.
- Jerome.** HERRON (M. C.) A study of the clausulae in the writings
 of St. Jerome.
 9 × 6 in. pp. xiv + 132. Washington. 1937.
- Lactantius.** Opera omnia. Edd. S. Brandt and G. Laubmann.
 i. Divinae institutiones et epitome divinarum institutionum.
 ii, 1. Libri de opificio Dei et de ira Dei, carmina, fragmenta,
 vetera de Lactantio testimonia.
 ii, 2. De mortibus persecutorum liber. Indices.
 8½ × 5¾ in. pp. cxviii + 761; lxxxii + xxxvi +
 568. Vienna. 1890-97.
- Livy.** Book v. Ed. J. E. Pickstone.
 6½ × 4¼ in. pp. viii + 196. 1938.
- Lucretius.** De rerum natura libri sex. Ed. H. A. I. Munro.
 6 × 3¾ in. pp. xl + 190. Cambridge. 1889.
- De rerum natura. Transl. by R. C. Trevelyan.
 7¾ × 5¼ in. pp. xvi + 295. Cambridge. 1937.
- Petronius.** RINI (A.) Petronius in Italy from the thirteenth cen-
 tury to the present time.
 8¾ × 6 in. pp. viii + 181. New York. 1937.
- Pervigilium Veneris.** Ed. with transl. and notes by C. Clementi.
 8½ × 6¾ in. pp. xii + 269. Oxford. 1936.
- Plautus.** Comédies. Tome v. Mostellaria—Persa—Poenulus.
 Text and French transl. by A. Ernout. [Assn. G. Budé.]
 8 × 5¼ in. pp. [498.] Paris. 1938.

- Plautus.** v. Stichus, Trinummus, Truculentus, Vidularia, fragments.
Ed. with Engl. transl. by P. Nixon. [Loeb. Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 366. 1938.
- Pliny the Younger.** Panegyrique de Trajan. *Ed.* M. Durry.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 274. Paris. 1938.
- Quintilian.** Quintilian on education. Selected passages from the
 Institutio Oratoria. Translated by W. M. Smail.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xlviii + 143. Oxford. 1938.
- Seneca.** Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam (quae
 vocantur). *Ed.* C. W. Barlow.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. vii + 164. Rome. 1938.
- PITTET (A.) Vocabulaire philosophique de Sénèque, 1.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvii + 213. Paris. 1937.
- Suetonius.** Libri vii–viii. Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Divus Vespasianus, Divus Titus, Domitianus. *Ed.* G. W. Mooney.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 662. 1930.
- GRAF (H. R.) Kaiser Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu
 Suetons vita Divi Vespasiani.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 149. Stuttgart. 1937.
- Tacitus.** Annals, Bks. xiii–xiv. *Ed.* with Engl. transl. by J. Jackson. [Loeb Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. vi + 423. 1937.
- * ——— Annals. *Ed.* H. Furneaux. Second edition. 2 vols.
 $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. viii + 691; 519. Oxford.
 1896–1907.
- Agricola. Translated by G. J. Acheson.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. 100. 1938.
- MUCH (R.) Die Germania des Tacitus.
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xiv + 464. Heidelberg. 1937.
- Terence.** FEHL (P.) Die interpolierte Recension des Terentztextes.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 152. Berlin. 1938.
- Valerius Maximus.** SCHULLIAN (D. M.) Valerius Maximus and
 Walter Map. [Speculum xii, 4.]
 $10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 3. Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- Varro.** On the Latin language. i. Books v–vii. *Ed.* with Engl.
 transl. by R. G. Kent. [Loeb Class. Lib.]
 $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 1 + 367. 1938.
- Virgil.** Aeneid iii. *Ed.* R. W. Moore.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xi + 105. 1938.
- Aeneid ix. *Ed.* B. Tilly.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 109. 1938.
- BOAS (H.) Aeneas' arrival in Latium. [Allard Pierson
 Stichting. Arch.-hist. Bijdragen vi.]
 $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ in. pp. 260. Amsterdam. 1938.
- JOHNSON (S.) Virgil's Georgics and labour on the land.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 26. Toronto. 1937.
- LISBON. Biblioteca Nacional. Exposição Vergiliana, catálogo.
 9×6 in. pp. xiv + 214. Lisbon. 1931.

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Dictionaries.

- Bauer (D. W.)** Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften
 des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen
 Literatur.
 $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 745. Berlin. 1937.
- Blackwell's** Byzantine hand list.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. vii + 67. Oxford. 1938.
- Id.* Another copy.

- Caelamanos (D.)** Review of *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, by D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson. [Nature, 139, Feb. 1937.]
 $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 5. St. Albans. 1937.
- Harvey (P.)** The Oxford companion to classical literature.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xii + 468. Oxford. 1937.
- Costas (P. S.)** An outline of the history of the Greek language.
 $10\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 143. Chicago. 1936.
- Greindl (M.)** Κλέος, κύδος, εὔχος, τιμή, φάτις, δόξα. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des epischen und lyrischen Sprachgebrauches.
 $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 161. Lengerich. 1938.
- Kolokotsas (E. D.)** Τὸ πρωτογενὲς σατυρικὸν δράμα τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων. Τὸ σατυρικὸν δράμα ἈΓΓΗΝ.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. pp. 57. Athens. 1938.
- Lazarides (L. A.)** Le conte grec. L'art du conte chez les grecs anciens. Part i.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 18. Athens. 1938.
- Lesky (A.)** Die griechische Tragödie.
 $7 \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 258. Leipsic. 1938.
- MacGregor (M.)** Studies and diversions in Greek literature.
 9×6 in. pp. 307. 1937.
- Marg (W.)** Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung (Semonides, Homer, Pindar). [Kieler Arbeiten z. Klass. Phil. 1.]
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 105. Würzburg. 1938.
- Abel (W.)** Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern.
 $9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 143. Berlin. 1930.
- Della Corte (F.)** La filologia latina dalle origini a Varrone.
 10×7 in. pp. viii + 165. Turin. 1937.
- Enk (P. J.)** Handboek der latijnse letterkunde van de oudste tijden tot optreden van Cicero. Part 2 in 2 vols.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 339; 345. Zutphen. 1937.
- Löfstedt (E.)** Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae.
 $10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 360. Oxford, Uppsala, Leipsic. 1936.
- Vermischte studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xiii + 232. Lund. 1936.
- Pasquali (G.)** Preistoria della poesia romana.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 84. Florence. 1936.
- Sas (L. F.)** The noun declension system in Merovingian Latin.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xx + 529. Paris. 1937.
- Fitzhugh (T.)** The Indoeuropean accent.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xxx + 69. Charlottesville, Va. 1937.
- Kolár (A.)** De dactyloepitritis.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 84. Bratislava. 1935.
- Serretta (M.)** Endecasillabi crescenti nella poesia italiana delle origini e nel canzoniere del Petrarca.
 $10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xxi + 245. Milan. 1938.
- Vandvik (E.)** Rhythmus und Metrum. [Symb. Oslo. Fasc. Supp. viii.]
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 238. Oslo. 1937.
- Lavagnini (B.)** Ἡ ἐξέλιξις τῶν μεθόδων εἰς τὴν κλασσικὴν φιλολογίαν. [Ἑρμηνεύς, 11.] $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 24. Athens. 1937.

Union académique internationale. Emploi des signes critiques, disposition de l'apparat dans les éditions savantes de textes grecs et latins. Conseils et recommandations. Edition nouvelle.

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 50. Paris and Brussels. 1938.

Translations.

Hardie (W. R.) *Silvulae Academicae.*

$9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 117. 1912.

Picciotto (S.) *Perseus and Andromeda.* [Chancellor's prize for Latin verse composition, 1938.]

$7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 9. Oxford. 1938.

Woodhouse (C. M.) *Pope's Sappho to Phaon, ll. 179-end.* [Gaisford prize for Greek verse.]

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 9. Oxford. 1938.

PHILOSOPHY

Dudley (D. R.) *A history of Cynicism from Diogenes to the sixth century A.D.*

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 224. 1937.

Frenkian (A. M.) *Études de philosophie présocratique, ii. La philosophie comparée—Empédocle d'Agrigente—Parménide d'Elée.*

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 110. Paris. 1937.

PREHELLENIC AND FOREIGN

Cairo. *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire.*

Die Entstehung des Generalkatalogs und seine Entwicklung in den Jahren 1897-1899. By L. Borchardt.

$13\frac{3}{4} \times 10$ in. pp. 12. Berlin. 1937.

Denkmäler des alten Reiches (Ausser den Statuen). By L. Borchardt. Part i.

14×10 in. pp. 244. Berlin. 1937.

Funerary statuettes and model sarcophagi, fasc. 2. By P. E. Newberry.

14×10 in. pp. 101. Cairo. 1937.

Money-Coutts (M.) *A stone bowl and lid from Byblos.* [Berytus, iii.]

11×8 in. pp. 8. Beirut. 1936.

Gitti (A.) *Orizzonti della storia greca primitiva nell' ultimo ventennio (la questione dei Greci nei documenti ittiti).*

10×7 in. pp. 14. Rome. 1937.

Fuchs (S.) *Die griechischen Fundgruppen der frühen Bronzezeit und ihre auswärtigen Beziehungen.*

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 157 + 12 pl. Berlin. 1937.

Ducati (P.) *Le problème étrusque.*

$9 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 207. Paris. 1938.

Giglioli (G. Q.) *L'arte etrusca.*

$13\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. lxxii + 78 + 426 plates. Milan.

Whatmough (J.) "Tusca origo Raetis." [Harvard Stud. Class. Phil. xlviii.]

$8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ in. pp. 22. Cambridge, Mass. 1937.

Buttler (W.) *Der Donauländische und der Westische Kulturkreis der jüngeren Steinzeit.* [Handbuch der Urgeschichte Deutschlands, 2.]

$11\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 108. Berlin and Leipsic.

1938.

- Spreckhoff (E.)** Die nordische Megalithkultur. [Handbuch der Urgeschichte Deutschlands, 3.]
 $11\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 160. Berlin and Leipsic. 1938.

HISTORY

- Bengtson (H.)** Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. i. [Münch. Beiträge z. Papyrusforsch., 26.]
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. xii + 235. Munich. 1937.
- Bikerman (E.)** Institutions des Séleucides.
 $11\frac{1}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 268. Paris. 1938.
- Dimitrakos (G.)** Demetrios Poliorketes und Athen.
 $9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 95. Hamburg. 1937.
- Ehrenberg (V.)** Alexander and the Greeks.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. v + 110. Oxford. 1938.
- Galling (K.)** Syrien in der Politik der Achaemeniden bis zum Aufstand des Megabyzos 448 v. Chr. [Der Alte Orient, 36.]
 $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 51. Leipsic. 1937.
- Hampl (F.)** Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geb.
 10×7 in. pp. v, 144. Leipsic. 1938.
- Jaeger (W.)** Demosthenes. The origin and growth of his policy.
 $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. x + 273. Cambridge. 1938.
- Kroymann (J.)** Sparta und Messenien. [Neue Philolog. Untersuch., 11.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxix + 115. Berlin. 1937.
- Leuze (O.)** Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320. [Schr. d. Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 11.]
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 320. Halle. 1935.
- MacKenzie (C.)** Pericles.
 9×6 in. pp. 351. 1937.
- Meissner (B.)** Die Achämeniden Könige und das Judentum. [Sitz.-Ber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1938, ii.]
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 23. Berlin. 1938.
- Papastavru (I.)** Τὸ ἐν Ἀθῆναις συνέδριον τῶν συμμάχων κατὰ τὸ ἔτος 370 π. Χ. [Ἑλληνικά, 10.]
 9×6 in. pp. 17. Athens. 1938.
- Tarn (W. W.)** The Greeks in Bactria and India.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxiii + 539. Cambridge. 1938.
- Wilcken (U.)** Die letzten Pläne Alexanders des Grossen. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. xxiv.]
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 18. Berlin. 1937.
- Wuest (F. R.)** Philipp II von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338. [Münch. hist. Abhand. i. 14.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. x + 188. Munich. 1938.
- Cumont (F.)** L'Égypte des astrologues.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ in. pp. 254. Brussels. 1937.
- Wallace (S. L.)** Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. ix + 512. Princeton. 1938.
- Allen (B. M.)** Augustus Caesar.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xiii + 261. 1937.
- Buchan (J.)** Augustus.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 356. 1937.
- Bilz (K.)** Die Politik des P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus. [Würzburger Studien, 7.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 81. Stuttgart. 1935.
- Bottai (G.)** L'Italia di Augusto e l'Italia d'oggi. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, i.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 24. Rome. 1938.

- Ciaceri (E.)** Le origini di Roma.
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. vii + 473. Milan. 1937.
- Ciccotti (E.)** Profilo di Augusto.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 157. Turin. 1938.
- De Regibus (L.)** Problemi d'impero nella storia romana del terzo secolo.
 $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 88. Turin. 1936.
- Faider (P.)** Gli studi belgi sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, ii.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 12. Rome. 1937.
- Frank (T.)** An economic survey of ancient Rome. Vol. iv. Roman Africa, by R. M. Haywood.
 Roman Syria, by F. M. Heichelheim.
 Roman Greece, by J. A. O. Larsen.
 Roman Asia, by T. R. S. Broughton.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 950. Baltimore. 1938.
- Fuchs (H.)** Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 102. Berlin. 1938.
- Gagé (J.)** Gli studi francesi sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, i.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 27. Rome. 1937.
- Grazioli (F. S.)** Il genio militare di Cesare. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, 2.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 20. Rome. 1938.
- Guey (J.)** Essai sur la guerre parthique de Trajan (114-117). [Bibliothèque d'Istros, ii.]
 $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 157. Bucharest. 1937.
- Kornemann (E.)** Gli studi germanici sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, iv.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 18. Rome. 1937.
- Lambrechts (P.)** La composition du sénat romain de Septime Sévère à Dioclétien (193-284).
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 130. Budapest. 1937.
- Jones (A. H. M.)** The cities of the eastern Roman provinces.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 576. Oxford. 1937.
- Miltner (F.)** Gli studi austriaci sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, vi.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 20. Rome. 1938.
- Patsch (C.)** Der Kampf um den Donauraum unter Domitian und Trajan. (Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa V/2.) [Sitz.-Ber. d. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien., Phil.-hist. Kl., 217, i.]
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 252. Vienna and Leipsic. 1937.
- Premmerstein (A. von)** Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ in. pp. xii + 290. Munich. 1937.
- * **Rostovtzeff (M.)** The social and economic history of the Roman Empire.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxv + 695. Oxford. 1926.
- Van Buren (A. W.)** Gli studi americani sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, v.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 17. Rome. 1937.
- Vulić (N.)** Gli studi jugoslavi sulla figura e l'opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell' impero romano. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi stranieri, vii.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 14. Rome. 1938.

- Baggally (J. W.)** *Ali Pasha and Great Britain.*
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 95. Oxford. 1938.
- Graves (R.)** *Count Belisarius.*
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. x + 527. 1938.
- Kalamenopoulos (N.)** *Ἡ διπλωματία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου.*
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 127. Athens. 1938.
- Kalamenopoulos (N.)** *Ἡ στρατιωτικὴ ἐργανῶσις τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς αὐτοκρατορίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου.*
 $8 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 318. Athens. 1937.
- Marrou (H.-I.)** *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique.*
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xv + 620. Paris. 1938.

MODERN GREEK

- Dascalakis (A.)** *Rhigas Veletinlis: la révolution française et les préludes de l'indépendance hellénique.*
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. pp. 230. Paris. 1937.
- *Les oeuvres de Rhigas Veletinlis. Étude bibliographique.*
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. pp. 126. Paris. 1937.
- Lazarides (L. A.)** *Ἀδραστεῖα ἦτοι ὕμνοι πρὸς τὰς πόλεις καὶ νήσους τῆς Ἑλλάδος.*
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. ix + 142. Alexandropolis. 1931.
- Mankana (S. D.)** *Χιάς. Ἦτοι ἐμμετρος ἀφήγησις τῶν κυριωτέρων μυθολογικῶν καὶ ἱστορικῶν ἐπεισοδίων τῆς νήσου Χίου.*
 10×7 in. pp. xvi + 170. Athens. 1937.
- Mexa (V. G.)** *Οἱ Φιλικοί.*
 10×7 in. pp. xiii + 96. Athens. 1937.
- Phteris (G.)** *Ἡ θρυλικὴ ζωὴ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Βουρβάχη.*
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 173. Athens.

MAPS

- Delaporte (L.)** *Atlas historique. i. L'antiquité.*
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 20 + 30 maps. Paris. 1937.
- Africa, Eastern.** *Carta dell' Africa orientale. 1 : 3,500,000.*
 [Touring Club Italiano.]
 $32\frac{1}{2} \times 23\frac{1}{2}$ in. Milan. 1935.
- Italy.** *Carta d'Italia del Touring Club Italiano. Scale 1 : 500,000;*
 13 sheets. $25 \times 12\frac{1}{2}$ in. Milan. 1933-37.

TOPOGRAPHY AND EXCAVATION

- Krencker (D.) and Zschietzsehmman (W.)** *Römische Tempel in Syrien. [Denkmäler antiker Architektur, v.] Text and Plates.*
 $13\frac{1}{2} \times 10$ in. pp. xxv + 297; viii + 118 pl. Berlin. 1938.
- Noeldeke (A.) and others.** *Neunter vorläufiger Bericht über die von der deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka unternommenen Ausgrabungen. [Abh. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, No. 11.]*
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 39. Berlin. 1938.
- Thomsen (P.)** *Die Palästina-Literatur, v. 3. Die Literatur der Jahre 1925-1934.*
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 465-704. Leipsic. 1938.
- Antioch-on-the-Orontes. ii.** *The excavations, 1933-1936. Ed. R. Stillwell.*
 14×11 in. pp. vii + 223; 80 plates. Princeton. 1938.
- Bethlehem.** **CHALMERS-HUNT (D. R.)** *Buried Bethlehem.*
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 46. Canterbury. 1937.

- Ras Shamra.** SCHAEFFER (C. F. A.) La huitième campagne de fouilles à Ras Shamra-Ugarit. [Syria, xviii.]
11 × 9 in. pp. 131. Paris. 1937.
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua.** Vol. v. Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea. *Edd.* C. W. M. Cox and A. Cameron.
11½ × 8½ in. pp. lii + 201. Manchester. 1937.
- Ephesos.** Forschungen veröffentlicht vom oesterreichischen archäologischen Institute. Band iv, Heft 2.
16 × 12½ in. pp. 227. Baden. 1937.
- Pergamon.** BERLIN STATE MUSEUMS. Altertümer von Pergamon. ix. Das Temenos für den Herrscherkult. By E. Boehringer and F. Krauss.
x. Die hellenistischen Arsenale. By A. von Szalay and E. Boehringer.
14 × 10½ in. pp. x + 168; viii + 63. Berlin. 1937.
- Smyrna.** CADOUX (C. J.) Ancient Smyrna.
9 × 6 in. pp. xlv + 438. Oxford. 1938.
- Griaznov (M.)** Le Kourgane de Pazyryk. [Hermitage Museum publ.]
8½ × 5¾ in. pp. 44. Leningrad. 1937.
- Casson (S.)** Ancient Cyprus, its art and archeology.
7½ × 5 in. pp. xii + 214. 1937.
- Cyprus.** The Committee for the preservation of the ancient and mediaeval monuments of Cyprus. Third report, 1937.
11 × 8½ in. pp. 18. 1937.
- Schaeffer (C. F. A.)** Missions en Chypre 1932-1935.
11 × 9 in. pp. x + 162; 41 pl. Paris. 1936.
- Djemila.** ALLAIS (Y.) Djemila.
8 × 5½ in. pp. 81. Paris. 1938.
- Nubia.** CAIRO. Service des antiquités de l'Égypte. Mission archéologique de Nubie, 1929-34. Aniba, ii. By G. Steindorf. Text and plates.
14 × 11¼ in. pp. 260; xii + 149 plates.
Hamburg. 1937.
- Saqqara.** CAIRO. Service des antiquités de l'Égypte. Excavations at Saqqara. The Tomb of Hemaka. By W. B. Emery. 13¼ × 10¾ in. pp. viii + 64. Cairo. 1938.
- Wharton (E. L.)** Wine-dark Seas. 8¾ × 5½ in. pp. 309. 1937.
- Argos.** BLEGEN (C. W.) Prosymna. The Helladic settlement preceding the Argive Heraeum. With a chapter on the jewellery and ornaments by E. P. Blegen. Text and Plates.
12¾ × 9½ in. pp. xxvi + 486 + 8 pl. Cambridge. 1937.
- Chios.** SGOUROS (K. A.) Ἱστορία τῆς Νήσου Χίου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τοῦ 1700 μ.Χ.
9¾ × 7 in. pp. xii + 658. Athens. 1937.
- Euboea.** KALOGEROPOULOS (D. P.) Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν βιβλιογραφίαν τῆς νήσου Εὐβοίας καὶ τῶν Θεσσαλικῶν Σποράδων, 1471-1937.
9 × 6 in. pp. 351. Athens. 1937.
- Olynthus.** Excavations at Olynthus. Part viii. The Hellenic house. By D. M. Robinson and J. W. Graham.
11 × 8 in. pp. xxi + 370. Baltimore. 1938.
- ROBINSON (D. M.) Olynthos. [Paulys Realencyklopädie.]
9½ × 6½ in. pp. 9. Stuttgart.

- Piraeus.** MARSTRAND (V.) Arsenalet i Piraeus og oldtidens Byggeregler.
 $12\frac{1}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 287. Copenhagen. 1922.
- Pherae.** BÉQUIGNON (Y.) Recherches archéologiques à Phères de Thessalie.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 111. Paris. 1937.
- Philippi.** COLLART (P.) Philippes, ville de Macédoine. Text and Plates.
 $10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xi + 558; xv + 88 pl. Paris. 1937.
- Propylaea.** STEVENS (G. P.) The Periclean entrance court of the Acropolis of Athens [Hesperia, v].
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 66. Cambridge, Mass. 1936.

- Guida d'Italia della Consociazione Turistica Italiana.** Lucania e Calabria. By L. V. Bertarelli.
 $6\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 403. Milan. 1938.
- Attraverso l'Italia, vol. viii. Puglia, Lucania, Calabria.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ in. pp. 240. Milan. 1937.
- Guida pratica ai luoghi di soggiorno e di cura d'Italia. iii. Le stazioni idrominerali.
 $6\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 222. Milan. 1936.
- Frothingham (A. L.)** Roman cities in northern Italy and Dalmatia.
 $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xix + 343. 1910.
- Maiuri (A.)** The Phlegraean Fields from Virgil's tomb to the Grotto of the Cumaean Sibyl.
 $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. 146. Rome. 1937.
- Krautheimer (R.)** Corpus basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The early Christian basilicas of Rome (iv-ix cent.). Vol. i. No. 1.
 15×11 in. pp. xx + 64. Vatican City. 1937.
- Marucchi (O.)** Le catacombe romane.
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. xxxi + 702. Rome. 1933.
- Ricci (C.)** Via dell' Impero. French transl. by M. R. Anglès.
 $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. 143. Rome. 1933.

- Capri.** MAIURI (A.) Breviario di Capri.
 $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 236. Naples. 1937.
- Luna.** BANTI (L.) Luni.
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 202. Florence. 1937.
- Ostia.** CALZA (G.) The dead cities of Italy. Ostia. 2nd edition.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 21. Novara. 1934.
- Paestum.** MARZULLO (A.) Paestum: i templi e i nuovi scavi.
 $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 43. Salerno. 1936.
- Tombe dipinte scoperte nel territorio Pestano.
 $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 22. Salerno. 1935.
- Pompeii.** SOGLIANO (A.) Pompei nel suo sviluppo storico. Pompei preromana.
 10×7 in. pp. viii + 296. Rome. 1937.
- Verona.** MARCONI (P.) Verona Romana.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 179. Bergamo. 1937.

- Arnould (M.-A.)** Notes pour servir à l'histoire ancienne de la Sambre.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 11. Thuin. 1937.
- Maeyer (R. de)** De Romeinsche villa's in België.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 331. Antwerp. 1937.

Uslar (R. von) Westgermanische Bodenfunde des ersten bis dritten Jahrhunderts nach Christus aus Mittel- und West-Deutschland.

$12\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xvi + 272. Berlin. 1938.

Scharf (J.) Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Rheinlande auf epigraphischer Grundlage.

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 175. Berlin. 1938.

Lauriacum. GAHEIS (A.) Lauriacum. Führer durch die Altertümer von Enns.

$7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 92. Linz. 1937.

Limes. Der obergermanisch-raetische Limes des Roemerreiches.

Abt. B. Bd. i. Die Kastelle Nr. 1-7 (1896-) 1937.

Bd. ii, 1. Die Kastelle Nr. 8-11 (1904-) 1937.

Bd. ii, 2. Die Kastelle Nr. 12-23 (1894-) 1914.

Bd. ii, 3. Die Kastelle Nr. 24-31 (1897-) 1915.

Bd. iii. Die Kastelle Nr. 32-38 (1896-) 1914.

Bd. iv. Die Kastelle Nr. 38a-45a (1894-) 1929.

Bd. v, 1. Die Kastelle Nr. 46-60 (1896-) 1914.

Bd. v, 2. Die Kastelle Nr. 61-62a (1897-) 1937.

Bd. vi. Die Kastelle Nr. 63-70 (1894-) 1929.

Bd. vii. Die Kastelle Nr. 71-75 (1901-) 1914.

Nijmegen. BRUNSTING (H.) Het grafveld onder Hees bij Nijmegen. Een bijdrage tot de kennis van Ulpia Noviomagus.

$10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 216. Amsterdam. 1937.

Transylvania. DAICOVICIU (C.) La Transylvanie dans l'antiquité.

$9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 95. Bucharest. 1938.

Trier. LOESCHKE (S.) Der Tempelbezirk im Altbachtale zu Trier. Heft 1. Planausschnitt, Ritonatempel und Umgebung. Text and Plates.

$12\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 140; 32 pl. Berlin. 1938.

Davies (O.) Ancient mines in Montgomeryshire. [Collections Hist. and arch. relating to Montgomeryshire and its borders.]

$10 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 6. Welshpool. 1937.

Collingwood (R. G.) and Myres (J. N. L.) Roman Britain and the English settlements. Second edition.

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxvi + 515. Oxford. 1937.

Moore (R. W.) The Romans in Britain.

$7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. pp. xii + 214. 1938.

Quennell (M. and C. H. B.) Everyday life in Roman Britain. 2nd ed. revised.

$8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 124. 1937.

Strong (E.) Viaggio attraverso le strade della Britannia romana. [Quaderni dell' Impero: le grande strade, 6.]

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 29. Rome. 1938.

Burgh Castle. IVES (J.) Remarks upon the Garianonum of the Romans.

$8\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ in. pp. xx + 54. Yarmouth. 1803.

Verulamium. LOWTHER (A. W. G.) Verulamium: Insulae xii and xiii. [St. Albans & Herts. Archit. and Arch. Soc. Trans., 1935.]

$10\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 5.

ANTIQUITIES

Bonner (R. J.) and Smith (G.) The administration of justice from Homer to Aristotle. Vol. ii.

9×6 in. pp. 320. Chicago. 1938.

Borettini (L.) Societas e communio in due recenti studi romanistici. [Riv. Ital. per le scienze giurid. vii. 1932.]

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 20. Rome. 1932.

- Bosdas (D.)** Περὶ τοῦ γάμου. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν μελέτην τοῦ γάμου κατὰ τὴν Ἑκλογὴν τῶν Ἰσαύρων.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 80. Athens. 1937.
- Ciccotti (E.)** Le leggi matrimoniali di Augusto. [Riv. di storia economica.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 15. Turin. 1937.
- Duff (P. W.)** Personality in Roman private law.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xiii + 241. Cambridge. 1938.
- Freshfield (E. H.)** Roman Law in the later Roman Empire. Byzantine Guilds.
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxv + 69. Cambridge. 1938.
- Gmelin (U.)** Römische Herrscheridee und päpstliche Autorität.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 154. Stuttgart. 1937.
- Konopka (Z. Zmigryder)** Alle fonti della procedura penale romana.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 36. Florence. 1937.
- Levi (M. A.)** Auspicio imperio ductu felicitate. [Rendiconti del R. Ist. Lombardo, lxxi, 1.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 18. Milan. 1938.
- Puglisi (S.)** L'assistenza sociale. [Civiltà romana, 2.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 15. Rome. 1938.
- Schmaehling (E.)** Die Sittenaufsicht der Censoren.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. ix + 171. Stuttgart. 1938.
- Volterra (E.)** Diritto romano e diritti orientali.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 308. Bologna. 1937.
-
- Berchem (D. van)** L'annone militaire dans l'empire romain au iii^e siècle. [Mém. Soc. nat. Antiq. de France, 1936.]
 $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 90. Paris. 1937.
- Durry (M.)** Les cohortes prétoriennes.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 454. Paris. 1938.
- Rodgers (W. L.)** Greek and Roman naval warfare.
 10×7 in. pp. xvi + 555. Annapolis. 1937.
- Spaulding (O. L.)** Pen and sword in Greece.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. x + 151. Princeton. 1937.
-
- Azevedo (M. C. de)** I trasporti e il traffico. [Civiltà romana, 4.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 43. Rome. 1938.
- Carettoni (A.)** Banchieri ed operazioni bancarie. [Civiltà romana, 3.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 43. Rome. 1938.
- Endenburg (P. J. T.)** Koinoonia. En gemeenschap van zaken bij de Grieken in den klassieken tijd.
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 218. Amsterdam. 1937.
-
- Acerbo (G.)** L'agricoltura italica al tempo d'Augusto. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, viii.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 34. Rome. 1938.
- Almagià (R.)** L'orizzonte geografico nell'epoca di Augusto e gli studi geografici in Roma. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, iv.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 22. Rome. 1938.
- Bulle (H.)** Das Theater zu Sparta.
 9×6 in. pp. 114. Munich. 1937.
- Busink (Th. A.)** Prothuron. Inleidende studie over het woonhuis in Oud-Griekenland.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xv + 160. Batavia-Centrum. 1936.
- Jennison (G.)** Animals for show and pleasure in ancient Rome.
 9×6 in. pp. xiv + 209. Manchester. 1937.
- Marrou (H.-I.)** Μουσικὸς ἀνὴρ. Étude sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains.
 $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 312. Grenoble. 1938.

Monumenta musicae byzantinae. Edd. C. Hoeg, H. J. W. Tillyard and E. Wellesz. ii. *Hirmologium Athoum. Codex Monasterii Hiberorum* 470.

14 × 9½ in. pp. 27 + 150 plates. Copenhagen. 1938.

——— *Transcripta*. Vol. ii. The hymns of the *Sticherarium* for November. By H. J. W. Tillyard.

10¼ × 7¼ in. pp. xx + 177. Copenhagen. 1938.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY

Festugière (A. J.) *L'idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Évangile.*

10 × 6½ in. pp. 340. Paris. 1932.

Kern (O.) *Die Religion der Griechen.* iii. Von Platon bis Kaiser Julian. 9½ × 6¼ in. pp. v + 352. Berlin. 1938.

Nilsson (M. P.) *Archaic Greek Temples with fire-places in their interior.* [Studier tillägnade Otto Rydbeck.]

8¼ × 6¼ in. pp. 6. ? Lund. 1937.

Altheim (F.) *A history of Roman religion.*

8¾ × 5¾ in. pp. xi + 548. 1938.

Bonner (C.) *Some phases of religious feeling in later paganism.* [Harvard Theol. Rev., 30.]

9½ × 6½ in. pp. 22. Cambridge, Mass. 1937.

Cumont (F.) *After life in Roman paganism.*

9 × 6 in. pp. xvi + 225. New Haven. 1922.

Rohde (G.) *Die Kultsätze der römischen Pontifices.* [Religionsgesch. Versuche, xxxv.]

9½ × 6½ in. pp. viii + 180. Berlin. 1936.

Turehi (N.) *La religione.* [Civiltà romana, 1.]

9½ × 6¾ in. pp. 71. Rome. 1938.

Dionysiac. BROMMER (F.) *Satyroi.*

9½ × 6¾ in. pp. 60. Würzburg. 1937.

Jupiter. KOCH (C.) *Der römische Juppiter.*

10 × 6¾ in. pp. 136. Frankfurt a.M. 1937.

——— RONZEVALLE (S.) *Jupiter Héliopolitain: nova et vetera.* [Mélanges de l'Univ. S. Joseph, xxi.]

10 × 7¼ in. pp. 181. Beyrouth. 1937.

Paris. REINHARDT (K.) *Das Parisurteil.* [Frankfurter Stud. 14.]

8 × 6¼ in. pp. 31. Frankfurt a.M. 1938.

Perseus. WOODWARD (J. M.) *Perseus. A study in Greek art and legend.*

8 × 6 in. pp. xiv + 98; 33 pl. Cambridge. 1937.

Senmurv. TREVER (C.) *Senmurv-Paskud the dog-bird.* [Hermitage Museum publ.] *In Russian.*

6 × 4½ in. pp. 72. Leningrad. 1937.

Wolf. ECKELS (R. P.) *Greek wolf-lore.*

8 × 6 in. pp. 88. Philadelphia. 1937.

Barnes (A. S.) *Christianity at Rome in the Apostolic age.*

8 × 5¼ in. pp. xiii + 222. 1938.

Kennedy (V. L.) *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass.*

10½ × 7 in. pp. viii + 212. Vatican City. 1938.

ART

Curtius (L.) *Die klassische Kunst Griechenlands.*

11½ × 9 in. pp. 466. Potsdam. 1938.

Rice (D. Talbot) The icons of Cyprus. With chapters by R. Gunnis and T. Talbot Rice.

$11\frac{1}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 287; 52 pl. 1937.

Van der Meer (F.) *Maestas Domini: théophanies de l'Apocalypse dans l'art chrétien.*

$10\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ in. pp. 546. Rome. 1938.

Amsterdam. Allard Pierson Museum. *Algemeene Gids.*

$7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 240; 100 pl. Amsterdam.

Chiusi. Il museo civico di Chiusi. By D. Levi. [Le guide dei musei italiani.]

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 153. Rome. 1935.

Constantinople. Meisterwerke der archäologischen Museen in Istanbul. iii. Die Sammlung türkischer und islamische Kunst im Tschinili Koschk. By E. Kühnel.

$14 \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 45 + 40 plates. Berlin. 1938.

—— Musée des Antiquités. Guide illustré des bronzes.

$7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 26. Constantinople. 1937.

Naples. Nationalmuseum Neapel. Die archäologischen Sammlungen. 3rd edition. By G. C. Fiego.

$8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 76. Naples. 1938.

—— Pitture murali e mosaici nel museo nazionale di Napoli. By O. Elia. [Le guide dei musei italiani.]

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 158. Rome. 1932.

Rome. Le Terme di Diocleziano e il museo nazionale romano. By R. Paribeni. [Le guide dei musei italiani.]

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 350. Rome. 1932.

Syracuse. Il regio museo archeologico di Siracusa. By G. Libertini. [Le guide dei musei italiani.]

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 190. Rome. 1929.

Palladio. Vol. i. 6. L'architettura nella Mostra Augustea della Romanità. $12\frac{3}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 40. Milan. 1937.

Sturgis (R.) European architecture.

9×6 in. pp. xxviii + 578. 1896.

Berlin State Museums. Katalog der Sammlung antiker Skulpturen. v. Römische Kopien griechischer skulpturen des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. By C. Blümel.

$13\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 46 + 80 plates. Berlin. 1938.

Photographische Einzelaufnahmen antiker Skulpturen ("Arndt-Amelung"). Serie xv B. Text. Ed. G. Lippold.

$10\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. ii + 47. Munich. 1938.

Rome. VATICAN MUSEUM. Sculture del magazzino del museo Vaticano. Text and plates. By G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg.

$14\frac{1}{2} \times 10$ in. pp. xxi + 315; 116 plates.

Vatican City. 1936-1937.

Antonsson (O.) The Praxiteles marble group in Olympia.

$10 \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 209. 1937.

Dornseiff (F.) Der sogenannte Apollon von Olympia. 2nd edition. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 43. Greifswald. 1938.

Meissner (B.) and Opitz (D.) Die Heimkehr des Kriegers. Ein nacharchaisches griechisches Relief. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1938, xiii.]

$10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 25. Berlin. 1938.

- Gerster (E.)** Mittelrheinische Bildhauerwerkstätten im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 131. Bonn. 1938.
- Hahl (L.)** Zur Stilentwicklung der provinzialrömischen Plastik in Germanien und Gallien.
 $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 70. Darmstadt. 1937.
- Poulsen (F.)** Die Römer der republikanischen Zeit und ihre Stellung zur Kunst. [Die Antike, xiii.]
 $10\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 26. Berlin. 1937.
- Rodenwaldt (G.)** Kunst um Augustus. [Die Antike, xiii.]
 $11 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 41. Berlin.
- Van Essen (C. C.)** De Beeldhouwer Pasities. [Mededeel. van het nederlandsch hist. Inst. te Rome. Tweede Reeks, Deel vii, 1937.]
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 12.
- Calza (G.)** La famiglia di Augusto. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, v.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 26. Rome. 1937.
- Augustus.** **MONTINI (I.)** Il ritratto di Augusto. [Civiltà romana, 5.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 94. Rome. 1938.
- **MUSTILLI (D.)** L'iconografia e l'epopea di Augusto nella glittica. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, vi.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 16. Rome. 1938.
- Claudius.** **STUART (M.)** The portraiture of Claudius. Preliminary studies. 9 x 6 in. pp. xiv + 93. New York. 1938.
- Darsow (W.)** Sizilische Dachterrakotten.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 118. Berlin. 1938.
- Klumbach (H.)** Tarentiner Grabkunst. [Tübinger Forsch. zur Archäologie, xiii.]
 $12\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 99. Reutlingen. 1937.
- Richter (G. M. A.)** Etruscan terracotta warriors in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
 $12\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 18 + 24 pl. New York. 1937.
- Bielefeld (E.)** Archäologische Vermutungen.
9 x 6 in. pp. 21. Würzburg-Aumühle. 1938.
- Hafner (G.)** Viergespanne in Vorderansicht.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. viii + 133. Berlin. 1938.
- Lacroix (L.)** La faune marine dans la décoration des plats à poissons. 10 x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 69; 40 pl. Verviers. 1937.
- * **Pfuhl (E.)** Masterpieces of Greek drawing and painting. Translated by J. D. Beazley.
 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ in. pp. viii + 150. 1926.
- Wedeking (E. Homann-)** Archaische Vasenornamentik in Attika, Lakonien und Ostgriechenland.
 $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 78. Athens. 1938.
- Oswald (A.)** The Roman pottery kilns at Little London, Lincs.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 32. Wellow. 1937.
- Oswald (F.)** Index of figure-types on Terra Sigillata ("Samian Ware"). [Annals of Arch. and Anthropol., supplement.]
 $15 \times 11\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 154 + 91 plates. Liverpool. 1936-37.
- Beazley (J. D.) and Jacobsthal (P.)** Bilder griechischer Vasen.
11. Sakonides. By A. Rumpf.
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 30 + 32 plates. Leipsic. 1937.
- ——— 12. Frühitaliotische Vasen. By A. D. Trendall.
 $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 44 + 32 plates. Leipsic. 1938.

- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum.** Belgium, fasc. 2: Bruxelles: Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire (Cinquantenaire), fasc. 2. By F. Mayence and V. Verhoogen.
 13×10 in. pp. 45 + 48 plates. Brussels. [1937.]
 ——— Deutschland 1. Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum, 1. By A. Greifenhagen.
 $13 \times 10\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 53 + 46 plates. Munich. 1938.
 ——— U.S.A., fasc. 6: Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md., fasc. 2. By D. M. Robinson.
 13×10 in. pp. 38 + 57 plates. Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- Bucharest.** COLIU (E.) La collection de vases grecs du Musée Kalinderu. [Bibliothèque d'Istros, i.]
 $10\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 136. Bucharest. 1937.
- Leningrad.** Hermitage Museum. Vase from Kum. [Regina Vasorum.] By A. A. Peredolsky.
 $5\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 14. Leningrad. 1937.
 ——— Moulded vases from Phanagoria. By A. A. Peredolsky.
 $5\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 14. Leningrad. 1937.
- Manchester.** WEBSTER (T. B. L.) Four Greek Vases in the Manchester Museum. [Memoirs, Manch. Lit. & Phil. Soc. lxxxii, 1937-38.]
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 10. Manchester. 1937.
- Beyen (H. G.)** Die Pompejanische Wanddekoration vom zweiten bis zum vierten Stil. i. Text and plates.
 13×10 in. pp. xi + 370; 54 pl. The Hague. 1938.
- Nersessian (S. der)** L'illustration du roman de Barlaam et Joasaph. 2 vols.
 13×10 in. pp. iv + 250; 19 + 102 plates. Paris. 1937.
- Kyrou (A. A.)** Οἱ Ἑλλῆνες τῆς Ἀναγεννήσεως καὶ ὁ Δομήνικος Θεοτοκόπουλος.
 $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 467. Athens. 1938.
- Bendineilli (G.)** Il tesoro di argenteria di Marengo. [Monumenti d'arte antica, i.]
 $13\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 70. Turin. 1937.
- Treuer (C.)** Nouveaux plats sassanides de l'Hermitage.
 10×7 in. pp. 41. Leningrad. 1937.
- Kovrig (I.)** Die Haupttypen der kaiserzeitlichen Fibeln in Pannonien. $11\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 131. Budapest. 1937.
- Morosan (N.)** Une fibule germanique particulière d'époque impériale-romaine trouvée en Bessarabie.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 15. Chisinau. 1935.
- Bibliothèque Nationale.** Collection Pauvert de la Chapelle. Intailles et camées donnés au département des médailles et antiques de la Bibliothèque Nationale. By E. Babelon. $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xxiv + 62. Paris. 1899.
- Thorpe (W. A.)** The prelude to European cut glass. [Trans. Society of Glass Technology, 22.]
 $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 33. 1938.

NUMISMATICS

- Royal Numismatic Society.** Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress, London, June 30-July 3, 1936. Edd. J. Allan, H. Mattingly, E. S. G. Robinson.
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. ix + 490. 1938.

Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue des monnaies grecques de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Les Rois de Syrie, d'Arménie et de Commagène. By E. Babelon.

$11\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. ccxxii + 268. Paris. 1890.

Collections, Anonymous. Monnaies grecques, romaines et byzantines. Collection de feu M.H.O. à S. et de plusieurs autres amateurs.

$10 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 78. Basle. 1938.

Sylloge nummorum graecorum. Vol. iii. The Lockett Collection. Part 1. Spain—Italy.

$15\frac{1}{2} \times 11\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 12 + 12 plates. 1938.

Macedon. GAEBLER (H.) Fälschungen makedonischer Münzen, iv. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, xxx.] $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 20. Berlin. 1937.

Alfoeldi (A.) A festival of Isis in Rome under the Christian Emperors of the 4th century. [Dissertat. Pannon. Ser. ii. Fasc. 7.]

$11\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 95. Budapest. 1937.

Cesano (S. L.) Numismatica Augustea. [Quaderni Augustei. Studi Italiani, iii.]

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 33. Rome. 1938.

Herzfelder (H.) Contribution à la numismatique de la Décapole. [Rev. Num., 1936.]

$9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 12. Paris. 1936.

Jongkees (J. H.) Lydische Münzinschriften. [Acta Orient. xvi.]

$9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 7. 1938.

—— Μουλιστήριον: eine lydische Glosse. [Acta Orient. xvi.]

$9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 6. 1937.

Milne (J. G.) Archbishop Laud and the University collection of coins. [Oxoniensia, vol. i (1936).]

10×7 in. pp. 2.

Milne (J. G.) The development of Roman coinage.

$8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. 22. Oxford. 1937.

—— Egyptian currency under the Ptolemies (summary). [Actes du V^e congrès de papyrologie, 1937.]

$9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 5.

Sutherland (C. H. V.) Coinage and currency in Roman Britain. 9×6 in. pp. xii + 184. Oxford. 1937.

INSCRIPTIONS

Austin (R. P.) The stoichedon style in Greek inscriptions.

$9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 130. Oxford. 1938.

Kirk (G. E.) Era-problems in the Greek inscriptions of the southern desert. [Journal, Palestine Oriental Soc., vol. xvii, 1937.] $9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 9. Jerusalem.

Kolbe (W.) Thukydides und die Urkunde IG I² 63. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Inst. Kl. xxii.]

$10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 20. Berlin. 1937.

Meritt (B. D.) Documents on Athenian tribute.

$10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. xii + 135. Cambridge, Mass.

* **Tod (M. N.)** A selection of Greek historical inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C. 1937.

$9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xx + 256. Oxford. 1933.

Aetolia. KLAFFENBACH (G.) Asylievertrag zwischen Ätolien und Milet. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, xx.] $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 7. Berlin. 1937.

'Anja Hafir. KIRK (G. E.) Excavations at 'Anja Hafir. The Greek inscriptions. [Journal, Palestine Oriental Soc., xvi.] 8×6 in. pp. 7. Jerusalem. 1936.

- Delos.** INSCRIPTIONS DE DÉLOS. Décrets postérieurs à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 1497-1524). Dédicaces postérieures à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 1525-2528). Textes divers, listes et catalogues, fragments divers postérieurs à 166 av. J.-C. (Nos. 2529-2879). *Edd.* P. Roussel and M. Launey. 2 parts in 1. $14\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. viii + 447. Paris. 1937.
- Hermopolis.** ZUCKER (F.) Doppelinschrift spätptolemäischer Zeit aus der Garnison von Hermopolis Magna. [Abh. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., 1937, Phil.-hist. Kl. 6.] $11\frac{1}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 63. Berlin. 1938.
- Nazareth.** LOESCH (S.) Diatagma Kaisaros. Die Inschrift von Nazareth und das Neue Testament. $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xiii + 100. Freiburg. 1936.
- MARKOWSKI (H.) Diatagma Kaisaros. De Cesare manium iurum vindice. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 120. Posen. 1937.
- Thessaly.** ARVANITOPOULOS (TH.) Δώδεκα Θεσσαλικά ἐπιγράμματα, νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενα. [Πολέμων, ii.] 10×7 in. pp. 77. Athens. 1935-1938.
- Fabretti (R.)** Inscriptionum antiquarum quae in aedibus paternis asservantur explicatio et additamentum. $12\frac{3}{4} \times 9$ in. pp. 759. Rome. 1699.
- Spain.** MORÁN (P. C.) Neue lateinische Inschriften aus Spanien. [Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, 18.] $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 10. Berlin. 1937.

PAPYRI AND MANUSCRIPTS

- Clark (K. W.)** A descriptive catalogue of Greek New Testament manuscripts in America. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xxvii + 418. Chicago. 1937.
- Guéraud (O.) and Jouguet (P.)** Un livre d'écolier du iii^e siècle avant J.-C. 11×9 in. pp. xxxi + 60. Cairo. 1938.
- Kapsomenakis (S. G.)** Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit. [Münch. Beiträge z. Papyrusforsch., 28.] $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xvi + 148. Munich. 1938.
- Mayser (E.)** Grammatik der griechische Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. i, Laut- und Wortlehre. Teil 2. Flexionslehre. 2nd edition. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xvi + 215. Berlin. 1938.
- Milne (H. J. M.) and Skeat (T. C.)** Scribes and correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 112. 1938.
- Seidl (E.)** Demotische Urkundenlehre nach den frühptolemäischen Texten. [Münch. Beiträge z. Papyrusforsch., 27.] $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ in. pp. vi + 28. Munich. 1937.
- Wileken (U.)** Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde). ii. Papyri aus Oberägypten (2). $14 \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 91-213. Berlin and Leipsic. 1937.
- Berlin.** Aegyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden, ix. Steuerlisten römischer Zeit aus Theadelphia. By H. Kortenbeutel. $10\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. x + 268. Berlin. 1937.
- Cairo.** Service des antiquités de l'Égypte. Le Martyre d'Apa Epima. By T. Mina. $10\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. xxxii + 126. Cairo. 1937.

- Milan.** CAZZANIGA (I.) Dai papiri della R. università di Milano.
[Rendiconti del R. Ist. Lombardo, 70.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ in. pp. 4. Milan. 1937.
- Torbidi giudaici nell' Egitto Romano nel secondo
secolo di Cristo: un papiro della R. Università di
Milano. [Annuaire de l'inst. de philologie et d'histoire
orientales et slaves, v.]
 $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. pp. 9. Brussels. 1937.
- Princeton.** KASE (E. H.) Papyri in the Princeton University
Collections. Vol. ii.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. xii + 130; 10 pl. Princeton.
1936.
- Uppsala.** BJÖRCK (G.) Der Fluch des Christen Sabinus. Papyrus
Upsaliensis 8.
 $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. pp. 165. Uppsala. 1938.
- Venice.** NERSESSIAN (S. DER) Manuscrits arméniens illustrés des
xii^e, xiii^e and xiv^e siècles de la bibliothèque des pères
Mekhitharistes de Venise. Text and Plates.
 $12\frac{1}{2} \times 10$ in. pp. xi + 198; xiv + 102 pl.
Paris. 1937.

TWENTY-FOURTH LIST OF
ACCESSIONS TO THE CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

TOPOGRAPHY, EXCAVATIONS, ETC.

The East.

- 66860 **Asia Minor**, map marking prehistoric sites (*Archaeologia*, 86, p. 3).
66853 **Persepolis**, Apadana stairway, relief showing Syrian tribute-bearers.

Greece.

- 65758 **Athens**, Propylaea; Ionic capital and entablature (Hege & Rodenwaldt, *Akropolis*, frontispiece).
66896 „ Erechtheion; S.W. angle of entablature (Hege & Rodenwaldt, *Akropolis*, pl. 100).

Italy and Sicily.

Rome.

- B4094 Forum, view from Palatine towards Basilica Aemilia.
B4091 „ Basilica Aemilia, view towards Curia.
B4092 „ „ „ view towards Curia and Capitol.
B4095 „ Basilica of Constantine and Maxentius, view from Aedes Vestae.
B4096 „ Curia from S.W.
B4097 „ Templum Divi Julii and Rostra Julii.
B4099 „ Temple of Venus and Rome seen from Colosseum.
B 982 Baths of Caracalla, aerial view.
B4101 Capitol, many-storeyed house by.
B4086 Column of Trajan and Basilica Ulpia.
B4081 Temple of Mars Ultor, from the W.
B4082 „ „ „ from the S.W.
B4085 Forum of Julius Caesar from the E.
B4083 Trajan's Market, boundary wall and hemicycle.
B4084 „ „ south-eastern part of hemicycle.
B4087 Forum of Nerva from the N.W.
B 981 Mausoleum of Augustus, during clearing operations.
B4088 Portico of Minucius.
B4102 Temples of Vesta and Fortuna Virilis.
B4090 Theatre of Marcellus from the E.

B 979 **Ostia**, Decumanus looking N.E. from *castrum*.
B4104 **Pompeii**, Forum, view N.W. towards Vesuvius.
B4105 „ „ „ view S.E.
B 983 „ Basilica seen from Forum.
B4106 „ Villa of Diomede, garden and peristyle seen from S.W.
B4107 „ S.E. corner of Palaestra near Amphitheatre in course of excavation.
B 985 **Venice**, the Doge's Palace, façade.
66897 **Sicily**. Map (Kiepert, *Forma orbis antiqui*).
66898 **Selinus**, sketch map.

Roman Britain.

- B1201 **Alfoldean**, plan of posting station.
B1202 **Ashted**, Roman villa, plan (1928).
B1203 **Bignor**, Roman villa, plan.
B1208 **Folkestone**, Roman villa, plunge bath.
B 984 **Richborough**, aerial view of the site.
B1212 **Silchester**, restored drawing of Roman temple.
B1213 „ „ „ Christian church.
B1214 **Southwick**, Roman villa, plan.
B1215 „ „ „ reconstruction, looking N. across central court.
B1216 „ „ „ reconstruction of corridor.
B1217 „ „ „ plan of baths to E. of court.
B 986 **York**, multangular tower from S.E.
B 987 „ „ „ „ N.W.

PREHELLENIC.

- C6890 **Atchana**, vase with papyrus design.
 C6800 **Cnossos**, 'Cupbearer' fresco, restored.
 C6881 **Enkomi**, carved ivory mirror handles (B.M. *Excavations in Cyprus*, pl. 2).
 C6882 " " " " (id. ib.).
 C6883 " ivory draught-box; hunting scene (id. pl. 1).
 C6884 " " " " (id. ib.).
 C6885 " " " two oxen (id. ib.).
 C6887 **Megiddo**, ivory comb, ibex attacked by hound; ivory plaque, recumbent griffin with outstretched wings.
 C6886 **Mycenae**, ivory plaque; griffin amid flowers (Bossert, *Altikreta*, fig. 230).
 C6888 " 2 ivory plaques; recumbent sphinxes with outstretched wings (ibid. fig. 229).
 C6889 " ivory; seated female figure (ibid. fig. 224).

INSCRIPTIONS.

- B1211 **Folkestone**, round tile inscribed CLASIS . BRIT.
 B 951 **Rome**. Altar dedicated to Hercules (*CIL*. VI (1) 301).

SCULPTURE.

- C6859 Restored pediments of the Old Parthenon, drawing (*Ath. Mitt.* 60/61, p. 87, fig. 14-15).
 C6961 'Dipylon' head (Casson, *Technique*, fig. 34).
 C6962 **Kore**. Acropolis Mus. No. 593 (Payne & Young, pl. 12, 2).
 C6964 " " " " 594 (ibid. pl. 46).
 C6966 " " " " 674 (ibid. pl. 76, 3).
 C6963 " " " " 679 (ibid. pl. 31, 2).
 C6968 " " " " 682 (ibid. pl. 42, 1).
 C6972 Archaic female head. Acropolis Mus. No. 643. Full face (Beazley & Ashmole, *Greek Sculpture*, fig. 50).
 C6965 " " " " " Profile (Payne & Young, pl. 71, 2).
 C6967 Horse and rider. Acropolis Mus. No. 700 (Payne & Young, pl. 137).
 C6899 Boxer from Sorrento; marble copy of Myronian type. Naples Mus.
 C6895 Temple of Nike Apteros, balustrade; Nike decking a trophy (cf. Hege & Rodenwaldt, *Akropolis*, pl. 75a).
 C6891 Praxitelean female head; Toledo Museum, U.S.A.
 B 988 **Octavia**, portrait bust. Carthage, Musée Lavigérie.
 C6969 Archaic bronze statuette of horseman from N. slope of Acropolis (*Hesperia*, vii, p. 205a).
 C6893 Colossal Etruscan terracotta statue; New York, Metropolitan Museum.

VASES.

- C6793 Protocorinthian aryballos (Payne, *Protokor. Vasemal.* pl. 11).
 C6785 Fikellura amphora at Altenburg; 'Komasts' (cf. Pfuhl, iii, p. 28, No. 132).
 C6792 Early moulded pithos; Perseus beheading Medusa (as Centaur). (Hampe, *Sagenbilder*, pl. 38a.)
 C6799 François vase, top frieze; arrival of Theseus (F.-R. pl. 13, detail).
 C5956 " " Troilos and Centauromachy friezes (F.-R. pl. 11-12).
 C6789 **Athena Promachos**; Panathenaic amphora in B.M.
 C6971 **Eos** and Memnon. Vatican. (Beazley, *Attic Blackfigure*, pl. 8).
 C6894 **Herakles**, apotheosis of; detail of krater by Exekias, from the Athenian Agora.
 C6795 **Perseus** and the Gorgons; athletic scenes: details of bf. tripod pyxis (Schaal, *Bilderhefte*, iii, pl. 16, No. 30).
 C6786 " death of Medusa; bf. dinos in Louvre.

Trojan Cycle.

- C6790 Achilles and Ajax at draughts; bf. amphora by Exekias in Vatican.
 C6791 Menelaus and companions; Protoattic vase fragment (Hampe, *Sagenbilder*, Abb. 30).
 C4794 Battle scenes. Exterior of cylix by Andocides combining bf. and rf. techniques (Pfuhl, iii, pl. 69).
 C6970 Citharode and listeners. Rf. vase by Andocides (Pfuhl, *Masterpieces*, pl. 17).
 C6787 Hounds pursuing a hare; interior of bf. cylix by the 'Gorgon' painter.
 C6788 'Komasts'; exterior of bf. cup in Athens.
 C6794 Symposium scene on bf. tripod pyxis (Schaal, *Bilderhefte*, iii, pl. 16, No. 30).

MOSAICS.

- COINS.**

- | | | |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| C6913 | Aggrigentum. | Mid 5th century tetradrachms (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 10 ^{1,3}). |
| C6926 | Camarina. | Early tetradrachm and didrachm (Syll. Num. Graec. ii, 864, 872). |
| C6914 | Gela. | Early tetradrachms (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 10 ^{5,6}). |
| C6915 | " | " " (ibid. pl. 10 ^{7,8}). |
| C6916 | " | " " (ibid. pl. 10 ^{9,10}). |
| C6917 | " | " " (ibid. pl. 11 ^{11,12}). |
| C6918 | Himera. | Early tetradrachm and didrachm (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 11 ^{13,14}). |
| C6931 | " | Early tetradrachm (N. Chron. 1935, pl. 3 ¹¹). |
| C6927 | " and Selinus. | Early drachms and didrachms (N. Chron. 1935, pl. 3 ¹⁻⁴). |
| C6928 | " | " " " " " " (Syll. Num. Graec. ii, 1005-6; 1209-10). |
| C6929 | " | " " " " " " (N. Chron. 1935, pl. 3 ⁵⁻⁸). |
| C6930 | " | " " " " " " didrachm, drachm and obols (ibid. pl. 3 ^{9,10,12}). |
| C6932 | " | " " " " " " Early tetradrachms (ibid. pl. 4 ^{13,14}). |
| C6933 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 4 ¹⁵⁻¹⁶). |
| C6934 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 4 ¹⁷⁻¹⁸). |
| C6935 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 4 ¹⁹⁻²⁰). |
| C6936 | " | " " " " " " didrachm, tetradrachm and obols (ibid. pl. 5 ^{25-27, 36, 37}). |
| C6919 | Leontini. | Mid 5th century tetradrachms (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 11 ^{15,16}). |
| C6920 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 11 ^{17,18}). |
| C6921 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 11 ^{19,20}). |
| C6922 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 11 ²¹). |
| C6923 | Selinus. | Mid 5th century tetradrachms (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 12 ^{22,23}). |
| C6924 | " | " " " " " " and didrachm (ibid. pl. 12 ^{24,25}). |
| C6925 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 12 ^{26,27}). |
| C6937 | " | Early tetradrachms, rev. only (Syll. Num. Graec. ii, 1221, 1223-4, 1228). |
| C6938 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 1229-1232). |
| C6939 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 1234, 1236, 1238). |
| C6940 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 1239, 1240). |
| C6941 | " | " " " " " " didrachms, rev. only (ibid. 1241-3, 1247, 1252, 1261, 1265-6). |
| C6901 | Syracuse. | Early tetradrachms (N. Chron. 1925, pl. 12 ^{28,29}). |
| C6902 | " | Early tetradrachm and didrachm (ibid. pl. 12 ^{30,1331}). |
| C6903 | " | Early to mid 5th century tetradrachms (ibid. 13 ^{32,33}). |
| C6904 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 13 ^{34,35}). |
| C6905 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 13 ^{36,37}). |
| C6906 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 13 ^{38,40}). |
| C6907 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 13 ^{39,41}). |
| C6908 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 14 ^{42,43}). |
| C6909 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 14 ^{45,46}). |
| C6910 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. 14 ^{47,48}). |
| C6911 | " | " " " " " " (ibid. pl. 14 ^{49,56}). |
| C6912 | " | and Catana. Mid 5th century tetradrachms (ibid. pl. 14 ^{51,104}). |
-
- | | | |
|-------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| B1148 | Maximian, | Maxentius and Constantine, folles; SALVIS AVGG. ET CAESS. FEL. KART., CONSERVATOR AFRICAE SVAE (N. Chron. 1934, pp. 146, 148, figs. 2, 3, 5, 7). |
| B1149 | " | and Constantine, folles; GENIO POPVLI ROMANI, GENIO POP. ROM. (ibid. pp. 153-4, figs. 8-10). |
| B1150 | " | Maxentius and Constantine, folles; CONSERVATORES KART. SVAE, CONSERV. VRB. SVAE (ibid. pp. 156, 158, figs. 11-16). |
| B1151 | " | folles; GENIO IMPERATORIS, GENIO POP. ROM., HERCVLI CONSERVATORI (ibid. pp. 162, 164, figs. 18-21). |
| B1152 | " | and Maxentius, aurei and folles; HERCVLI COMITI AVGG. ET CAESS. N.N., CONSERVATOR AFRICAE SVAE, FIDES MILITVM (ibid. pp. 147-8, figs. 4, 6). |
-
- | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| B1143 | Roman Aurei of the Arras Hoard, | 1 (N. Chron. 1933, pl. 22). |
| B1144 | " | " " " " 2 (ibid. pl. 23). |
| B1145 | " | " " " " 3 (ibid. pl. 24). |
| B1146 | " | " " " " 4 (ibid. pl. 25). |
| B1147 | " | " " " " 5 (ibid. pl. 26). |

MINOR ARTS.

- C6796 Cretan bronze shield (Kunze, *Kret. Bronzereliefs*, pl. 10).
 C6797 „ „ „ (*id. ib.* pl. 26).
 C6590 Bronze mirror in Paris; Aphrodite and swan (*Arch. Anz.* 1935, col. 370, fig. 2).
 C6851 Gold sword sheath from Kelermes (Kuban); Leningrad.
 C6852 Sword sheath as worn; relief at Persepolis.
 C6855 Greek jewellery and gold ornaments; B.M. (*JHS.* 1934, pl. 1).
 B 978 Set of silver vessels from house in Via dell' Abbondanza, Pompeii.
 C6857 Ivory diptych with miracle scenes. Syro-Hellenistic, 5th Cent. A.D. Victoria and Albert Museum.
 C6858 Fragment of ivory panel depicting the Miracle at Cana. ? Alexandrian, 5th-6th Cent. A.D. Victoria and Albert Museum.
 C6856 Coptic textile depicting the Annunciation; Victoria and Albert Museum.

MISCELLANEA.

- C6798 Shield of Herakles, reconstruction (Studniczka, *Ueber den Schild*, p. 75).
 C6892 Ostraca inscribed with the name of Themistocles, from the Agora, Athens.
 B 989 Roman warship, model.
 B 990 „ merchant vessel, model.

SETS OF SLIDES






THE main collection of some 12,000 lantern slides can be drawn on in any quantity, large or small, for lecturing on practically any branch of classical archaeology. For those who have opportunity, no method is so satisfactory as personal selection of the slides from the pictures arranged in a subject order in the Library. But the following sets of slides, complete with texts, will be found useful to those lecturers who have not facilities for choosing their own slides.

LIST OF SETS.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The Prehellenic Age (classified list of slides only). | The Greek Church (classified list of slides only). |
| Early Malta (N. S. Clogstoun). | Modern Greek Country Life (classified list of slides only). |
| The Geography of Greece (A. J. Toynbee). | |
| Ancient Athens: historical sketch (S. Casson). | |
| Ancient Athens: topographical (annotated list of slides only, D. Brooke). | |
| The Acropolis (A. H. Smith). | |
| Ancient Architecture (D. S. Robertson). | |
| Greek Sculpture (J. Penoyre). | Life in the Roman World (H. H. Symonds). |
| The Parthenon (A. H. Smith). | Ancient Life, Roman (annotated list of slides). |
| Greek Vases (M. A. B. Braunholtz). | Rome (H. M. Last). |
| Greek Painting (T. B. L. Webster. This has been so arranged that it can be given either as two lectures or, by the omission of all slides bearing even numbers, as one). | The Roman Forum (G. H. Hallam). |
| A Survey of early Greek Coins: 7 slides showing 49 coins (P. Gardner). | The Roman Forum, for advanced students (T. Ashby). |
| Some Coins of Sicily (G. F. Hill). | The Palatine and Capitol (T. Ashby). |
| Greek Papyri (H. I. Bell). | Trajan's Market-Buildings (A. H. Smith). |
| Olympia and Greek Athletics (E. N. Gardiner). | The Via Appia (R. Gardner). |
| Xenophon: the expedition of Cyrus and Xenophon's Anabasis (annotated list of slides only, by A. W. and B. I. Lawrence). | The Roman Campagna (T. Ashby). |
| Alexander the Great (D. G. Hogarth). | Roman Portraiture (Mrs. S. Arthur Strong). |
| The Travels of St. Paul (no text). | Romans in Portraiture (H. H. Symonds). |
| The Ancient Theatre (J. T. Sheppard). | Horace (G. H. Hallam). |
| Ancient Life, Greek (annotated list of slides only). | Virgil (H. R. Fairclough). |
| Some Ancient Handicrafts (annotated list of slides, A. W. Lawrence and W. T. Purdon). | Pompeii (A. van Buren). |
| Greek Scenery (classified list of slides only). | Ostia (T. Ashby). |
| | Ostia (R. Meiggs). |
| | Sicily (H. E. Butler). |
| | The Roman Rhone (S. E. Winbolt). |
| | Timgad (H. E. Butler). |
| | Roman Britain (Morimer Wheeler). |
| | The Roman Wall (R. G. Collingwood). |
| | The Roman Soldier (H. H. Symonds). |
| | The Religion of Roman Britain (Miss N. C. Jolliffe). |
| | The Byzantine Civilisation: unillustrated (J. B. Bury). |

The sets consist of about 50 carefully selected slides, and the cost of hire including the text and postage to members is 7s. 6d.

Application should be made to The Librarian, Hellenic and Roman Societies, 50, Bedford Square, W.C. 1.



TERRA-COTTAS

AL MINA SUEIDIA.



MNN 111



MNN. 97



MNN. 110



MNN. 149



MN. 370



MNN 151



MN. 64



MNN 115



MNN. 148



MNN 150



MN 108



MN. 426




MN. 130




LIMESTONE AND MARBLE FIGURES

AL MINA SUEIDIA.



MN 207



MNN 79



MNN. 86



MNN 23



MNN. 2. II



MN. 421



MN. 413



MN 203

BONE AND OTHER OBJECTS

AL MINA SUEIDIA



MN 13



MN 18



MN 39



MN 40



MNN. 28



MN. 16



MN. 51



MN. 17



MNN. 31



MNN. 44



MNN. 54



MNN. 55



MNN. 62



MNN. 92



MNN. 93



MNN 146



MNN 139



MNN 153



MNN 147



MNN 161



MNN 152



MNN 63



MNN 71



MNN 118



MNN 155

AMULETS

AL MINA. SUEIDIA



MN. 127



MNN. 123



MNN. 134



MNN. 57



MNN. 64



MNN. 124

CONICAL STONE SEALS.

CONICAL GLASS SEALS.



MNN. 5



MN. 317



MN. 432



MN. 434



MNN. 68



MNN. 145



MNN. 144



MN. 451

STONE STAMP SEALS.



MNN. 107



MN. 360



MNN. 1

CYLINDER SEALS



MN. 35



MN. 44



MN. 138



MN. 154



MN. 351



MN. 381



MN. 418



MN. 141

SCARABS



HELLENISTIC RELIEF IN MUNICH



TERRACOTTA EROTES IN BOSTON



ARCHAIC POROS HEAD OF HERAKLES FROM NORTH SLOPE OF ACROPOLIS.



2



3

ITHACA

1 2 PROTCORINTHIAN OENOCHOE

3. BRONZE HORSE



1
Obverse, TETRADRACHM OF ALINA
AR. *Brussels*. From a cast;
c.1.7x.



2
Reverse, DECADRACHM OF SYRACUSE—
THE DAMARLIEION
AR. *British Museum*. From a cast; c.1.5x.



3
Reverse of 1



4
Obverse, TETRADRACHM OF CALANA
AR. *British Museum*. From a cast,
c.2x.



5
Reverse of 4



6
Obverse, LITRA OF CALANA
AR. *British Museum*. From a cast,
c.4x.



7
Obverse, DRACHM OF SICILIAN NAXOS
AR. *British Museum*. From a cast;
c.2.5x.



8
Reverse of 7



9
Obverse, TETRADRACHM OF AETNA
= Plate XX.1. 3. From an electrolyte: c.2.5x.
After G. F. Hill, *Select Greek Coins*.



10
Obverse, TETRADRACHM OF SICILIAN NAXOS
AR. *British Museum*. From the coin: c.2.5x.
After G. F. Hill, *Select Greek Coins*.



11
A MODERN PASTICHE
Rizzo, *Saggi Preliminari su l'Arte della Moneta nella
Sicilia Greca*.



12
Reverse of 10

THE SOCIETY FOR THE
PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

50 BEDFORD SQUARE,
LONDON, W.C. 1.

List of Members

January, 1939

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

50 BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

HONORARY MEMBERS

- H.R.H. The Crown Prince of Sweden.
 Bidez, Prof. J., *Boulevard Léopold 60, Gand, Belgium.*
 Blegen, Prof. C. W., *University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.*
 Blinkenberg, Dr. C., *Kathrinevej 29, Hellerup, Denmark.*
 Breccia, Prof. Dr. E., *Ordinario d'Antichità classiche, Presso R. Università, Via Stampace 4, Pisa, Italy.*
 Buschor, Prof. E., *Archaeol. Seminar der Universität, Galeriestrasse, Munich.*
 Cumont, Prof. F., 13, *Avenue Kleber, Paris XVI.*
 de Sanctis, Prof. G., *Via Santa Chiara 61, Rome, Italy.*
 Diehl, Prof. C., 72, *Avenue de Wagram, Paris.*
 Dinsmoor, Prof. W. B., *School of Architecture, Columbia University, New York.*
 Dorpfeld, Prof. Dr. W., *Hortensienstr. 49, Berlin-Lichterfelde 1, Germany.*
 Dussaud, R., 30, *Rue Perronet, Neuilly s Seine, France.*
 Eldem, Dr. Halil Ethem, *Boite Postale 403, Istanbul, Turkey.*
 Ferguson, Prof. W. S., 8, *Scott Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
 Hatzidakis, Prof. G. N., *L'Université d'Athènes, Greece.*
 Hill, Dr. B. H., 9, *Plutarch Street, Athens, Greece.*
 Hiller von Gaertringen, Prof. Dr. F., *Freiherr, Ebereschenallee 11, Berlin-Charlottenburg 9.*
 Jaeger, Prof. Dr. W., 4554, *Greenwood Avenue, Chicago, U.S.A.*
 Karo, Prof. Dr. G., *Agnesstr. 4, Munich 13, Germany.*
 Keramopoulos, Prof. A. D., *Rue Eurytanas 8, Ampelokepoi, Athens, 6, Greece.*
 Koukouniotis, Dr. K., *Ethnikon Mouzeon, Athens, Greece.*
 Kretschmer, Prof. P., *Vorsteher des Indo-Germanisch Instituts der Universität, Vienna.*
 Nilsson, Prof. M. P., *The University, Lund, Sweden.*
 Nogara, Dr. B., *Direttore Generale dei Musei e Gallerie Pontificie, Città del Vaticano, Italy.*
 Oikonomos, Prof. G. P., *Odos Iroklitou 20, Athens, Greece.*
 Paribeni, Prof. R., *Direttore del Museo Nazionale Romano, Terme di Diocleziano, Rome.*
 Pfuhl, Prof. E., *Archaeol. Seminar der Universität, Basle, Switzerland.*
 Poulsen, Prof. Dr. F., *Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
 Rodenwaldt, Prof. Dr. G., *Holbeinstr. 53, Berlin-Lichterfelde-West, Germany.*
 Rostovtzeff, Prof. M., *Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.*
 Strzykowski, Prof. J., *Wußburg Gasse 29, Vienna, XIII 10.*
 Wilcken, Prof. U., *Leistikow Strasse 2III, Berlin-Charlottenburg 9, Germany.*
 Wilhelm, Dr. A., *Archaeol.-Epigraphisches Seminar der Universität, Vienna.*

LIST OF MEMBERS

* *Original Members.* † *Life Members.* ‡ *Life Members, Honoris Causa.* The other Members have been elected by the Council since the Inaugural Meeting.

N.B.—It is requested that the Secretary be informed of any error, omission, change of address, resignation or death.

- Abbott, E., 15, *Ravenscroft Park, Barnet, Herts.*
 Abernethy, Miss A. S., 11, *Queensberry House, Richmond.*
 Adam, Mrs., 29, *Barton Road, Cambridge.*
 Adams, Miss E. M., 180, *Aldersgate Street, E.C. 1.*
 †Adcock, Prof. F. E., O.B.E., F.B.A., *King's College, Cambridge.*
 Ainslie, Miss G., *Sedber, Sherborne, Dorset.*
 Ainsworth, J. F., *Artillery Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W. 1.*
 Aitken, Miss M. C., *St. George's School for Girls, Windmill Brae, Garscube Terrace, Edinburgh.*
 Aldington, Mrs., c/o *Lloyd's Bank, 67, Kingsway, W.C. 2.*
 Alexander, Miss C., *Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, U.S.A.*
 †Alford, Miss M., 6, *Garway Road, Westbourne Grove, W. 2.*
 Allan, J., *Dept. of Coins and Medals, British Museum, W.C. 1.*
 Allan, J. B., c/o *Bank of Montreal, 47, Threadneedle Street, E.C.*
 Allen, T. W., F.B.A., *Queen's College, Oxford.*
 Alleyne, Miss S. M., 67, *Bedford Gardens, W. 3.*
 Alton, Prof. E. H., *Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Anastasiadi, Monsieur P., *Mohammed Ali Club, Alexandria.*
 †Anderson, Prof. J. G. C., 25, *Charlbury Road, Oxford.*
 Anderson, J. K., *Wentworth House, Weybridge, Surrey.*
 Anderson, Prof. L. F., 364, *Boyer Avenue, Walla Walla, Washington, U.S.A.*
 Andrew, D. M., 51, *Carlton Place, Aberdeen.*
 Andrewes, A., 25, *Wellington Square, S.W. 3.*
 Andrews, Miss D. E., 11d, *Buckland Crescent, N.W. 3.*
 Apperson, Miss D., *Bibury, Packhorse Road, Gerrards Cross, Bucks.*
 Archer, R. L., *Plas Menai, Bangor.*
 Archibald, Miss E., *The High School, St. Albans.*
 Argenti, P. P., 8, *Princes Gardens, S.W. 7.*
 Armour, J. K. C., *Campbell College, Belfast.*
 Arnesen, Sorenskriver Ivar, *Tvedestrand, Norway.*
 Ashcroft, R. L., *Haileybury College, Hertford.*
 Ashmole, Prof. B., F.B.A., *High and Over, Amersham, Bucks.*
 Ashmole, Mrs. B., *High and Over, Amersham, Bucks.*
 Austin, R. P., 13, *Pakenham Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*
 Awano, R., *Weld Estate, Brookline, Mass., U.S.A.*
 Bacon, Miss J. R., *Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.*
 Baggally, J. W., 5, *Queen's Mansions, W. 6.*
 Bagot, Miss M. J. E., 25, *Rusholme Road, S.W. 15.*
 Bailey, Miss B. L., 23, *Southwood Avenue, Highgate, N.*
 Bailey, Cyril, F.B.A., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
 Bailey, G. L., *Lake Copais, Aliartos, Greece.*
 Bailey, Miss S. J., 20, *Sloane Court, S.W. 3.*
 Baker, C. M., *Meopham Green, Kent.*
 Baker, Right Hon. H. T., 4, *Albemarle St., W. 1.*
 *Balfour, Right Hon. The Earl of, *Fisher's Hill, Woking, Surrey.*
 Balmer, W. E., 16, *Cliffe Park, Roker, Sunderland.*
 Balsdon, J. P. V. D., *Exeter College, Oxford.*
 Barber, E. A., F.B.A., *Exeter College, Oxford.*
 Barber, G. L., 36, *Fernshaw Road, S.W. 10.*
 Barge, Mrs. S. M., 7, *Tavilton Street, W.C. 1.*
 †Barlow, Miss A. E. F., *Greenthorne, Edgworth, Bolton.*
 Barnard, Miss H. M., 117, *The Avenue, London Road, Newcastle, Staffs.*
 Barnett, R. D., 41, *Ossington Street, W. 2.*
 Barnsdale, Miss M. E., 65, *Longton Avenue, S.E. 26.*
 Barran, Sir John, *Sawley Hall, Ripon.*
 Barratt, Miss C., 16, *Wessex Gardens, N.W. 11.*
 Barrington-Ward, J. G., *Christ Church, Oxford.*
 Bartlett, Miss R. M., 28, *Hart Grove, W. 5.*
 Barton, Rev. Canon W. J., *Honey Garston, Shady Boxer, Salisbury, Wilts.*
 Batchelor, F., *Glasgow Academy, Glasgow.*
 Bateman, Miss M. A., 13, *Cambridge Road, S.W. 13.*
 Bates, Prof. W., 220, *St. Mark's Square, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.*
 Batley, Mrs. L., 50, *Woodholm Road, Sheffield, 11.*
 Battiscombe, E. M., *Ronceval, 27, Montpelier, Weston-super-Mare.*
 Battle, Prof. W. J., *University of Texas, Austin, Texas.*

- Bavnes, Prof. N. H., D.D., F.B.A., 46, *Abercorn Place, N.W.* 8.
- Beachcroft, Miss M., *High Row, Felixstowe College, Felixstowe, Suffolk.*
- Beames, Miss E., 100, *Oakley Street, S.W.* 3.
- †Bean, G. E., 2, *Mortlake Road, Kew, Surrey.*
- Beazley, Prof. J. P. D., F.B.A., 100, *Holywell, Oxford.*
- Beazley, Mrs. J. D., 100, *Holywell, Oxford.*
- †Beeley, A., *Casetta, Houndean Rise, Lewes, Sussex.*
- †Begg, W. R., *College of the City of New York, 17, Lexington Avenue, New York.*
- Bell, H. I., C.B., O.B.E., F.B.A., *British Museum, W.C.* 1.
- †Bell, H. W., 37, *Brimmer Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Bell, J., *St. Paul's School, W.* 14.
- †Benecke, P. V. M., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
- †Benn, Mrs. A., *Il Callegio, Via Del Palmerino, Florence, Italy.*
- Bennett, Miss E. M., "Borrowdale," 19, *Coronation Drive, Great Crosby, Liverpool.*
- Bennion, M. J., *Nevill House, St. Anne's Road, Eastbourne.*
- Bensinger, E. S., 15, *Manor House Drive, N.W.* 6.
- Benson, Rev. C. H., 5, *Hampstead Lane, N.* 6.
- Bentham, R. M., *Gore Lodge, High Street, Hampton, Middlesex.*
- †Benton, Miss S., 6, *Winchester Road, Oxford.*
- †Bernays, A. E., *Northumberland House, Richmond, Surrey.*
- Berridge, E. D., *Little Baddon Rectory, Chelmsford.*
- Bettenson, H. S., 118, *Southmoor Road, Oxford.*
- Bevan, Rev. C. O., 18, *Hyde Gardens, Eastbourne.*
- Bevan, E. J., *Haywardsfield, Stonehouse, Glos.*
- Bevan, E. R., *Lawrence's Farm, Betchworth, Surrey.*
- Binyon, D., *The University, Leeds.*
- Birley, Mrs. E., *Northbrook, Charterhouse, Godalming.*
- †Bissing, Fr. W., *Freiherr von, Oberaudorf am Inn, Oberbayern, Germany.*
- Blackett, J. P. M., 50, *South Street, Durham.*
- Blegen, Mrs. C. W., 9, *Plutarch Street, Athens.*
- Blench, Miss Q. M., 14, *Mount Echo Avenue, Chingford, Essex.*
- Bloesch, H., *Bonstettenstrasse 16, Berne, Switzerland.*
- Body, L. A., *St. Chad's College, Durham.*
- Boethius, Dr. A., *Villa Merubina, Fredrika Bremergatan, Göteborg, Sweden.*
- Bolling, Prof. G. M., *Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.*
- Bompas, Miss M. M., 60, *Sunningjude Road, N.W.* 4.
- Bonner, S. F., *Dept. of Latin, The University, Liverpool.*
- Boric, C. L., 17th and Sansome Street, *Philadelphia, U.S.A.*
- Bosanquet, G. C., *Croft, Seal, Sevenoaks.*
- Bourke, J. W. P., 8, *Moreton Gardens, S.W.* 5.
- Bowen, H. C., *Caldy View, Tenby, S. Wales.*
- Bowes, A. J. L., 15, *Queen's Gardens, Herne Bay, Kent.*
- Bowes, G. K., 5, *Oaklands Road, Bedford.*
- Bowra, C. M., F.B.A., *Wadham College, Oxford.*
- Bozie, Mrs. I. M.
- Braddick, Miss L., 37, *Eastbury Road, Northwood, Middlesex.*
- Bradley, L., 32, *Cranley Gardens, S.W.* 7.
- Bradshaw, Rev. R. H., *Church Missionary Society, Boulac, Cairo.*
- Brash, Miss I. F., *Edenhurst, Sheridan Road, S.W.* 19.
- †Braunholtz, Mrs., 22, *Old Road, Headington, Oxford.*
- Braun-Vogelstein, Mrs. J., *The Benedict House, Route 1, Box 147A, Carmel by the Sea, California, U.S.A.*
- Brewer, F. G., 32, *Hoadly Road, S.W.* 16.
- Brigg, W. A., *Kildwick Hall, Kighley.*
- Broadbent, H., 16, *St. Hilda's Terrace, Whitby, Yorks.*
- Broadrick, H. C., *Highfield, Windermere.*
- Brock, J. K., *The Little House, Ham Common, Surrey.*
- Brock, Miss M. D., *Mary Datchelor Girls' School, The Grove, Camberwell.*
- Brock, Miss P. M. L., 50, *Queens Road, Beckenham, Kent.*
- Brooke, Rev. A. E., D.D., F.B.A., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- Brooke, Lady, Flat 105, 15, *Portman Square, W.* 1.
- Brooks, E. W., F.B.A., *Dumolly, Milford-on-Sea, Lymington, Hants.*
- Broom, C. G. M., *The School House, Emmanuel School, Wandswoth Common, S.W.* 11.
- Broughall, Miss M. S., *End House, The Chantry, Norwich.*
- Brown, A. C. B., *The College, Marlborough, Wilts.*
- †Brown, A. E., "Brooklyn," 339, *Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge.*
- †Brown, J., *Galashill, Galashiels, N.B.*
- Brown, J. E. T., 2, *Cyprus Avenue, Lytham St. Annes, Lancs.*
- Brown, S. H., 18, *Cwzon Park, Chester.*
- Browne, Lady Gore, *Dean Prior Hotel, Torquay, Devon.*
- †Bruce, Miss A., 41a *Clanricarde Gardens, W.* 2.

- Brumwell, G. M., *Red Roofs, Budock Vean, Near Falmouth, Cornwall.*
- Buckler, W. H., F.B.A., 1, *Bardwell Road, Oxford.*
- Buckler, Mrs. W. H., 1, *Bardwell Road, Oxford.*
- Buckle, J. J., 36, *York Road, Rathgar, Dublin.*
- Bull, Miss E. B., *Little Menlo, 55, Beulah Hill, S.E. 19.*
- Bullen, Miss H. L., 39, *Gutham Street, S.W. 1.*
- Bullick, Rev. W. J., *Methodist College, Belfast.*
- Bulmer, R. H., *Adams Hill, Hereford.*
- Burdon, Rev. R. J., *Parkhurst House, Haslemere, Surrey.*
- Burn, A. R., *Redgate, Uppingham, Rutland.*
- †Burn, Miss B. K., *Dipton House, Riding Mill, S.O., Northumberland.*
- †Burnaby, R. B., 42, *Middleway, N.W. 11.*
- Burnett Brown, A. D., 'Vendley,' *Burke's Road, Beaconsfield, Bucks.*
- Burrell, P. S., *Braehead, Kingsland, Shrewsbury.*
- Burton, R. W., *Oriel College, Oxford.*
- Burton, Miss U., 16, *Kirkwick Avenue, Harpenden, Herts.*
- Burton-Brown, Miss B., *Prior's Field, Godalming, Surrey.*
- Burton-Brown, T., 21, *Park Crescent, Oxford.*
- Bushe, Brig.-Gen. F., *Drumalla, Rathmullen, Co. Donegal.*
- †Bushell, W. F., *Bukenhead School, Birkenhead.*
- Butler, Prof. H. E., 16, *Tavito Street, W.C. 1.*
- Butterwick, J. C., *Eton College, Windsor.*
- Buxton, E. J. M., *Remenham, Wilmslow, Cheshire.*
- Byrde, O. R. A., *Goytre House, Goytre, Nr. Pontypool, Monmouthshire.*
- Cacclamanos, H.E. Monsieur D., *Carrington House, Hertford Street, W. 1.*
- Calder, Prof. W. M., F.B.A., 58, *St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.*
- Callander, Prof. T., 11, *Osborne Terrace, Edinburgh.*
- †Calvocoressi, L. M., *Junior Athenaeum Club, 161, Piccadilly, W. 1.*
- Calvocoressi, M. J., 24, *Wilton Crescent, S.W. 1.*
- Calvocoressi, P. J., 23, *Hyde Park Gardens, W. 2.*
- Cameron, Prof. A., *Greek Dept., King's College, Aberdeen.*
- Cameron, Lieut.-Col. J. S., *Loze Wood, Bethersden, Ashford, Kent.*
- Campbell, Prof. A. Y., *Moorside, Culdy, Cheshire.*
- Campion, C. T., 21, *Florence Park, Bristol, 6.*
- Camps, W. A., *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*
- Capern, Miss C. E. J., 24, *Sussex Square, Brighton.*
- Carbery, Mary Lady, 60, *Verulam Road, St. Albans.*
- Caroe, F. T. K., 3, *Latham Road, Cambridge.*
- Carpenter, Miss A. M., 950, *Fifth Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.*
- Carter, Prof. F., *Saxile Club, 69, Brook Street, W. 1.*
- †Carthew, Miss, 6, *Albert Place, Victoria Road, W. 8.*
- Cartwright, R. F. W., *Aynho Park, Aynho, Banbury, Oxon.*
- †Cary, Prof. M., 7, *Bancroft Avenue, N. 2.*
- Caskey, Dr. L. D., *Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Caskey, Mrs. L. D., 11, *Garden Road, Wellesley Hills, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Cassavetti, D. J., *Basildon House, 7, Moorgate, E.C. 2.*
- Casson, Stanley, *New College, Oxford.*
- Cattell, F. M., 14, *Verulam Avenue, Purley, Surrey.*
- Cattley, T. F., *Eton College, Windsor.*
- Carvadias, Dr. A. P., 52, *Wimpole Street, W. 1.*
- Chalmers-Hunt, D. R., *Little Orchard, Broad Oak, Nr. Canterbury.*
- Chambers, Sir Edmund, K.B.E., C.B., F.B.A., 16, *Lathbury Road, Oxford.*
- Champness, Miss I. M., *Orchardleigh, Middle Way, Lewes, Sussex.*
- Chance, J. F., 30, *Lennox Gardens, S.W. 1.*
- Chance, Sir Roger, *Geddes House, Nairn, Scotland.*
- Chapin, Miss C., *Kildare, Frant, Sussex.*
- Chapman, Miss A. C., 25, *Wilbury Road, Hove.*
- Chapman, C. H., *Coatham School, Redcar.*
- †Chapman, S., *Staverton, 16, Alexandra Road South, Manchester.*
- †Charlesworth, M. P., *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- Chartier, Rev. Canon É., *Vice-Rector, Montreal University, Canada.*
- Chase, Prof. G. H., 36, *Holden Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Cheetham, N. J. A., *c/o Foreign Office, Downing Street, S.W. 1.*
- Childe, Prof. V. G., *The University, Edinburgh.*
- Chitty, Miss J. E., *Silvertrees, Barnes Close, Winchester.*
- Chitty, Miss L. F., *Upton Rectory, Nr. Didcot, Berks.*
- Christie, J. T., 19, *Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.*
- Clark, W. D., 44, *Berkeley Square, W. 1.*
- Clarke, M. L., 193, *Rosendale Road, S.E. 21.*
- †Clauson, Sir Charles, *Hatchhead House, Hatfield, Herts.*
- Clay, C. F., *Upton House, Grange Road, Cambridge.*
- Clements, E., 2, *Argyll Mansions, Addison Bridge, W. 14.*

- Clifford, Miss A. P., 210, *Station Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex.*
- Clogstoun, Lieut.-Col. H. O., 1, *Stamford Road, W. 8.*
- Clogstoun, Mrs. H. O., 1, *Stamford Road, W. 8.*
- Clough, Miss H., 2, *St. Stephens Avenue, Bispham, Blackpool.*
- Cluer, G. D., 7, *Beaverley Road, Colchester.*
- Cobb, Sir Cyril, K.B.E., 5, *Cornwall Terrace, N.W. 1.*
- Codd, Miss U. M., 12, *Hodford Road, N.W. 11.*
- Coghlan, J. C., *Westminster City School, S.W. 1.*
- Colchester, L. S., *The Cathedral School, Wells, Somerset.*
- Cole, S. C., 49, *Richmond Street, Hull, Yorks.*
- Colegate, A., *Redbourne Hall, Nr. Kinton Lindsay, Lincs.*
- Collander-Brown, W. H., *Hazeldene, Edgware-bury Lane, Edgware, Middlesex.*
- Collingwood, Prof. R. G., F.B.A., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
- Collinson, W. R., *Crofton, Normanton Road, S. Croydon.*
- Colman, D. S., No. 4, *The Schools, Shrewsbury.*
- Compton, A. T., *Westfield, Harepath Road, Seaton, Devon.*
- Connal, Prof. B. M., *Raupaki, Bramhope, Nr. Leeds.*
- Cook, Prof. A. B., 19, *Cranmer Road, Cambridge.*
- Cook, Miss C., *Ardmore, Portland Street, Lancaster.*
- Cook, G. G., *Thyra House, 9, Dane John, Canterbury.*
- †Cook, J. M., *The University, Edinburgh.*
- Cook, R. M., 3, *Roxean Avenue, Baguley, Altrincham, Cheshire.*
- Cooke, R., *The Croft, Detling, Maidstone.*
- Cookson, C., 15, *Staverton Road, Oxford.*
- Cookson, H. E., 29, *Downshire Hill, N.W. 3.*
- Coombe, A. N., 41, *Wenban Road, Worthing, Sussex.*
- Cooper, Rev. Canon A. N., *The Vicarage, Fife.*
- Cooper, Miss K., 48, *Chester Square, S.W. 1.*
- Corfiato, H., 57, *Springfield Road, N.W. 8.*
- Cormack, J. M. R., 220, *Gallowgate, Aberdeen.*
- Cornford, Prof. F. M., F.B.A., *Conduit Head, Madingley Road, Cambridge.*
- Corning, Prof. H. K., 49, *Wall Street, Room 1100, New York, U.S.A.*
- Costello, D. P., 1, *Moyley Road, Exeter, Devon.*
- Cottam, Rev. S. L., 16, *Northam Road, Oxford.*
- †Courtauld, S. L., *Eltham Hall, S.E. 9.*
- Courtauld, Miss S. R., *The Beacon, Weymouth.*
- Cowan, Miss G., 15, *Wilson House, Albion Road, S.W. 8.*
- Cowie, G. S., c/o *The London and Provincial Bank, 127, Edgware Road, W. 2.*
- Cox, C. W. M., *New College, Oxford.*
- Coxon, A. H., *Cowan House, George Square, Edinburgh.*
- Crace, J. F., *Treccin, Polbathic, Cornwall.*
- Craig, W. J., 14, *Bath Terrace, Tynemouth, Northumberland.*
- †Crawford, G. R., *Avonmore, Sharnford, Winchester.*
- Cree, Miss E. A., 14, *Melrose Avenue, Reading.*
- Crees, Dr. J. H. E., *Cathedral School, Hereford.*
- Crewe, Most Hon. The Marquess of, K.G., *Agyll House, 211, King's Road, S.W. 3.*
- Cripps, R., *Paley Cottage, White Waltham, Maidenhead.*
- †Crofts, F. N., *Judge's House, Agra, U.P., India.*
- Crosby, Miss M., *American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.*
- Cross, G. N., 99, *Elm Park Gardens, Chelsea, S.W. 10.*
- Cross, G. J., *Aston Tirrild Manor, Didcot, Berks.*
- †Crossman, Sir C. Stafford, *Buckhurst Hill House, Buckhurst Hill, Essex.*
- Crowe, E. G., 4, *Balmoral Terrace, Saltburn-by-Sea, Yorks.*
- Crowfoot, J. W., C.B.E., *Geldeston, Beccles, Suffolk.*
- Crowshaw, N. J., 46, *Inverlyde Road, Handsworth Wood, Birmingham. 20.*
- Crump, Miss M., 41, *Cowper Road, Harpenden, Herts.*
- Cullen, J. R., *Education Dept., Nicosia, Cyprus.*
- Culley, Mrs., 100, *Wildwood Road, Golders Green, N.W. 11.*
- Cumbers, E. W., 5, *The Glade, Ewell, Surrey.*
- Currie, P. W. E., 102, *Burdon Lane, Belmont, Sutton.*
- Currington, R. G., 185, *Pittshanger Lane, W. 5.*
- Cuttle, W. L., *Downing College, Cambridge.*
- Dale, Miss A. M., *Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.*
- Dale, F., *Mascalls, King's Road, Berkhamsted, Herts.*
- Dale, F. R., 48, *Ridgeway, N.W. 11.*
- D'Alton, Rev. Prof. J. F., *St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Co. Kildare.*
- Dalton, P. G. F., 1, *Woodchurch Road, N.W. 6.*
- Dalry, Lieut.-Col. Sir Hugh, K.C.S.I., *Buckland Grange, Ryde, I.o.W.*
- Dalziel, D. G., 63, *Park Road, Chiswick, W. 4.*
- Damry, P. N., *Deputy Collector, Dhulia (West Kahndesh-Bombay Dist.), India.*
- Dance, Miss E. M., 43, *Greencroft Gardens, N.W. 6.*
- Daniel, Sir Augustus, K.B.E., 2, *Hampstead Hill Gardens, N.W. 3.*
- Danson, J. R., 74, *Bedston Road, Birkenhead.*
- †Davidson, C. J., 28, *Rubislaw Den South, Aberdeen.*

- Davidson, H. W., *c/o The Secretariat, Freetown, Sierra Leone, British West Africa.*
- *Davies, Prof. G. A., *The University, Glasgow.*
- *Davies, Miss G. E., *Plas Dinam, Llandinam, Montgomeryshire.*
- *Davies, Miss M. S., *Plas Dinam, Llandinam, Montgomeryshire.*
- †Davies, O., *Cheyne House, Rodborough, Stroud, Glos.*
- Davies, W. S., 36, *Gwydr Crescent, Swansea.*
- Davis, R. K., *Magdalen College School, Oxford.*
- †Dawes, Miss E. A. S., *Newton, Oatlands Close, Weybridge.*
- Dawkins, Prof. R. M., F.B.A., *Plas Dulas, Llandulas, N. Wales.*
- Dayal, Har., 34, *Churchill Road, Edgware, Middlesex.*
- Deane, Prof. S. N., *Smith College, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Deas, H. T., *Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.*
- Deed, B. L., *Brook Rising, Ridgebourne Road, Shrewsbury.*
- Delta, E., *Kifissia, Nr. Athens.*
- Demehy, H. G., *c/o Assam Secretariat, Shillong, Assam, India.*
- †de Peyer, E. C. E., *Chesterfield, Meads, Eastbourne.*
- Desborough, Right Hon. Baron, G.C.V.O., *Panshanger, Hertford.*
- †Deubner, Prof. Dr. L., 55, *Friedrich Wilhelm Str., Schlachtessee, Berlin.*
- Dickson, E. A. W., 15, *Crane's Drive, Swinton.*
- Dickson, M. G., *North Sea Camp, Freiston, Boston, Lincs.*
- Dixon, P. J., *Foreign Office, S.W. 1.*
- Dobson, Prof. J. F., 11, *Cambridge Park, Redland, Bristol.*
- Dodds, Prof. E. R., 62, *High Street, Oxford.*
- Dohan, Mrs. E. H., *Hamnassett, Darling P.O., Delaware County, Pa., U.S.A.*
- Doll, C., 5, *Southampton Street, W.C. 1.*
- Dor, L., 39, *Rue Scheffer, Paris, XVI.*
- Doulton, A. J. F., *Witherhurst, Uppingham, Rutland.*
- Dowman, Mrs. C., *Trevissome, Flushing, Falmouth.*
- Downes, Miss P. K., 100, *Regent Road, Leicester.*
- Drake, H. L., *Pembroke College, Oxford.*
- Drinkwater, R. W., 27, *St. George's Avenue, Wolstanton, Stoke-on-Trent.*
- †Droop, Prof. J. P., 23, *Ullet Road, Liverpool.*
- Drury, Lewis, *St. Lawrence College, Ramsgate.*
- Dryhurst, A. R., 11, *Downshire Hill, N.W. 3.*
- Dudley, D. R., *Flat D, 1, Alexandra Road, Reading.*
- Duff, Miss M. G., *Girton College, Cambridge.*
- Duggan, M., *Ottoville, Tramore, Co. Waterford.*
- Dunbabin, T. J., 78, *Holland Park, W. 11.*
- Dundas, R. H., *Christ Church, Oxford.*
- Dunham, Miss A. G., 15, *Oxford Road, Worthing.*
- Dunlop, S. W. C., *c/o Chief Secretary, Madras Government, India.*
- Dunn, Miss E. B. J., *Upmeads, Reigate.*
- Dyson, G. W., 60, *Northway, N.W. 11.*
- Eagleston, A. J., 69, *Antrim Mansions, Antrim Road, N.W. 3.*
- Earp, Prof. F. R., *Hill Crest, Steyning, Sussex.*
- Easterling, H. G., *Field House, Stanley Road, Stourbridge, Worcestershire.*
- Eates, Miss M., 135, *Avenue Road, Acton, W. 3.*
- Eborall, Miss H. M., *Wyndham, Holland Road, Frinton-on-Sea, Essex.*
- †Eccles, Miss E., *Romney, Leyfield Road, West Derby, Liverpool.*
- Edgar, Prof. C. S., *Kya Lami, Victoria Road, Stellenbosch, S. Africa.*
- Edghill, Miss E. M., *St. Felix School, Southwold, Suffolk.*
- Edmonds, J. M., *Gryt-Horve Cottage, Storey's Way, Cambridge.*
- Edwards, B.S., 66, *Dartmouth Park Road, N.W. 5.*
- Edwards, M., *West Lawn, Lea Bank Avenue, Kidderminster.*
- Edwards, R. E., 1, *Arnold Road, Southampton.*
- †Edwards, Prof. W. M., *The University, Leeds.*
- Eggleshaw, J. H., *The Grammar School, Wakefield.*
- Eichholz, D. E., *Wills Hall, Stoke Bishop, Bristol.*
- Elgar, Mrs., *Forest House, East Cliff, Bournemouth.*
- †Elliot, Sir Francis, G.C.M.G., *Villa de la Mediterranée, Chemin de Provence, Cannes, France.*
- Elsworth, W. J., 22, *Gwelfor Avenue, Holyhead, Anglesey.*
- Engledow, Miss A. E., *The Girls' High School, Wigan.*
- *Eumorfopoulos, G., 7, *Chelsea Embankment, S.E. 3.*
- Eumorfopoulos, N., 41, *Gloucester Walk, W. 3.*
- Eustance, A., 7, *Brownlow Court, Brownlow Road, N. 11.*
- Evans, Sir Arthur J., F.R.S., F.B.A., *Youlbury, Berks, Nr. Oxford.*
- Evans, Miss H. R., *American School, Athens.*
- Evans, Miss J., 9, *Kensington Park Gardens, W. 11.*
- †Evans, Lady, 9, *Kensington Park Gardens, W. 11.*
- Facon, Miss E. A., 26, *Swinburne Street, Derby.*
- Fairlie, H. W., 17, *Mayfield Road, W. 3.*
- †Farquhar, Miss H., 6, *Loxendes Street, S.W. 1.*
- Farrell, Capt. J., *Brookside, Newland Park, Hull.*
- Farrington, Prof. B., 4, *Cumdonkin Terrace, Uplands, Swansea.*

- Faull, Miss B. M., *Queen Anne's School, Cavesham, Reading.*
- †Fay, H. C., *Evans House, Sedburgh, Yorks.*
- Felkin, F. W., *Ebbor Cottage, Wells, Somerset.*
- Ferguson, Miss K. I., 59, *Ashville Road, Bukenhead.*
- *Finn, Rev. D. J., *Rucci Hall. The University, Hongkong, China.*
- Finnegan, T., 6, *College Avenue, Londonderry, Ireland.*
- Fisher, Prof. C. S., *American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine.*
- Fisher, The Right Hon. H. A. L., F.B.A., *New College, Oxford.*
- †Fitzgerald, G. M., 1, *Chesterton Lane, Cambridge.*
- Fitzhardinge, L. F., Box 21, P.O., *Canberra, A.C.T., Australia.*
- Fitz-Herbert, J. A., *The University, Adelaide, Australia.*
- Flecker, H. L. O., *Christ's Hospital, W. Horsham.*
- Fleming, Miss D., 30, *Oak Lane, Bradford, Yorks.*
- Fletcher, Sir Frank, *Sutton Close, Redlap, Nr. Dartmouth.*
- Fletcher, Prof. G. B. A., *King's College, Newcastle-on-Tyne. 2.*
- Fletcher, H. M., 2, *Gray's Inn Square, W.C. 1.*
- Fletcher, Miss M. E. C., *Stanley House, Granville Street, Shrewsbury.*
- Foat, F. W. G., 'Ryebeck,' *Long Ditton, Surrey.*
- Forbes, P. B. R., *The University, Edinburgh.*
- †Ford, Sir Patrick Johnston, 8, *Moray Place, Edinburgh.*
- Forsdyke, Sir John, K.C.B., *Asheridge, Chesham, Bucks.*
- Forsey, Prof. G. F., *Granta, Upper Bassett, Southampton.*
- Forsey, J. M., *Hosey School, Westerham, Kent.*
- Forster, Prof. E. S., 1, *Oriel Road, Fulwood, Sheffield.*
- Fowler, Prof. H. N., 2205, *California Street, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*
- Frampton, Rev. R. E., *Innhams Corner, Crowborough, Sussex.*
- Francis, Miss I. G., 106, *St. George's Avenue, Tufnell Park, N. 19.*
- François, Señor E., *Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas, Calle Viamonte 430, Buenos Aires, Argentina.*
- Frank, E. J., *Anglické reálné Gymnasium, Ječná 26, Prague II, Czechoslovakia.*
- Franklin, A. D., 7, *College Precincts, Worcester.*
- Franklin, E. L., *Allegns School, Dulwich.*
- Frazer, John.
- Frazer, Dr. C., 9, *St. George's Place, Brighton. 1.*
- Frazer, Sir James, O.M., F.B.A., *Albamarle Club, 37, Dover Street, W. 1.*
- Freeman, F. L., 59, *Brookvale Road, Southampton.*
- Freeman, Miss K., *Lark's Rise, St. Mellons.*
- Freeman, Miss M. E., *The Women's College, Kangaroo Point, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.*
- Freshfield, Dr. E. H., *Glovers Farm, Reigate Hill, Surrey.*
- Frost, Rev. P. R., *The Rectory, Patrington, E. Yorks.*
- Fuller, B. A. G., *School of Philosophy, University of S. California, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.*
- *Furley, J. S., *The Manor Farm, Kencot, Lechlade.*
- Fyfe, T., *University School of Architecture, 1, Scoope Terrace, Cambridge.*
- Gallatin, A., 7, *East 67 Street, New York.*
- †Gardner, Prof. E. A., *Recess, Boyne Hill, Maidenhead.*
- Gardner, J. W., 24, *St. John's Road, Sidcup.*
- Gardner, Miss M. C., 19, *Hillview Terrace, Blackhall, Edinburgh. 4.*
- Gardner, R., *Emmanuel College, Cambridge.*
- Gardner, W. E., *Coral Villa, 91, Painswick Road, Gloucester.*
- †Garstang, Prof. J., *Institute of Archaeology, Liverpool.*
- †Gaselee, Sir Stephen, K.C.M.G., C.B.E., 24, *Ashburn Place, S.W. 7.*
- Gates, Miss S. M., 49, *Heavitree Road, Exeter.*
- Gaudet, Miss C., 120, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W. 3.*
- Gaunt, Miss E. M., 4, *Northumberland Road, Sheffield, 10.*
- Gearing, Miss A. W., 12, *Kensington Court Gardens, W. 8.*
- Geary, F. C., *Corpus Christi College, Oxford.*
- Gedge, Miss E. C., *Westfield College, N.W. 3*
- Genner, Miss G. B., 10, *Crick Road, Oxford.*
- †George, W. S., *Architect's Office, Raisina, Delhi, India.*
- Gerstley, Mrs. A. M., 61, *Great Cumberland Place, W. 1.*
- Gidney, A. R., *Cotton House, Marlborough, Wilts.*
- Gilbert, Miss D., 72, *Beech Hall Road, Highams Park, Chingford.*
- Gilham, E. L., 'Hesperia,' *Beggar's Lane, Leek, Staffs.*
- Gillespie, C. M., *The Crossways, Bramhope, Nr. Leeds.*
- †Gillies, M. M., *University College, Hull.*
- Gilling, R. W. N. B., *The Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C. 2.*
- Gilruth, Dr. J. D., *Drumkemno, 25, Frogston Road West, Edinburgh, 10.*
- Given, R. L., 1, *St. Ann's Villas, W. 11.*
- Glanville, Prof. S. R. K., 53, *North Road, N. 6.*
- Glover, Miss M. R., 4, *St. Margaret's Road, Oxford.*
- Goddard, E. H., 73, *Longton Avenue, S.E. 26.*

- Goldman, Miss H., 132, *East 70th Street, New York City, U.S.A.*
- Gomine, A. W., *The University, Glasgow.*
- Gorer, G., *The Croft, Bradford-on-Tone, Taunton.*
- Gorse, Miss B. M., *The Vicarage, Long Sutton, Wisbech.*
- Gosford, Right Hon. The Countess of, *Falmouth House, Clarendon Place, W. 2.*
- Gosling, W. F., *Station Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire.*
- Gow, A. S. F., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Graham, Miss E. Y., 52, *St. George's Court, Brompton Road, S.W. 3.*
- Graham, R. B., *King Edward VII School, Sheffield.*
- Grant, M., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Graves-Sawle, Lady, 29, *Rosary Gardens, S.W. 7.*
- Gray, E. W., *Christ Church, Oxford.*
- Gray, Miss G. E., *Dunelm Hotel, Durham.*
- Gray, H. A., *Welsh Scout Headquarters, Llandindod Wells.*
- Grazebrook, O. F., *Himley House, Nr. Dudley.*
- Green, F. D. L., *Finchcocks, Goudhurst, Kent.*
- Green, H. B., 10, *Bay View Road, Newhaven, Sussex.*
- Greenwood, J. A., *Funtington House, Nr. Chichester.*
- Greenwood, L. H. G., *Emmanuel College, Cambridge.*
- Greenwood, L. W., *Abberley Hall, Worcestershire.*
- Griffin, H. F., *Barnstable, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Griffith, Miss C. St. H., *Stobery, Church Road, Bromley, Kent.*
- †Griffith, J. G., 37, *Banbury Road, Oxford.*
- Griffiths, G. T., *Sandycroft, Kenwood Bank, Sheffield.*
- Grimsey, G. E., 28, *Woodwarde Road, S.E. 22.*
- Grundry, A. G., *The Pastures, Repton.*
- †Guiana, Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of, *Austin House, Georgetown, British Guiana.*
- Gulbenkian, C. S., 51, *Avenue d'Iéna, Paris.*
- Gulland, L. H. M., *Cumnor House School, Pampisford Road, S. Croydon.*
- †Gunning, Dr. G., *Algemeene Middelbare School, Bandoeng, Java, Dutch East Indies.*
- Gurner, C. W., 5, *Clive Street, Calcutta, India.*
- Guthrie, W. K. C., *Peterhouse, Cambridge.*
- Hackforth, R., *Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.*
- Hall, J. G., *Trinity College, Glenalmond, Perthshire.*
- Hall, Miss S. E., 6, *Prince Arthur Road, N.W. 3.*
- Hall, Miss W. L., 8, *Homefield Road, Bromley, Kent.*
- Hallam, Mrs., *S. Antonio, Tivoli, Roma, Italy.*
- Halliday, Mrs. E., 4, *St. Paul's Studios, Colet Gardens, Baron's Court, W. 14.*
- Halliday, Principal W. R., *King's College, Strand, W.C. 2.*
- Hallward, B. L., *Peterhouse, Cambridge.*
- Halsey, Sir Laurence, K.B.E., *Goosey, Worplesdon, Nr. Guildford.*
- Hamilton, W., 2, *Weston's Yard, Eton College, Windsor.*
- Hammond, J. L., *Oakfield, Hemel Hempstead.*
- Hammond, N. G. L., *The Rectory, St. Just-in-Roseland, Cornwall.*
- Handford, S. A., *Hurstleigh, Elm Park Road, Pinner, Middlesex.*
- Hankey, T., 2, *Belbroughton Road, Oxford.*
- Hann, A. J. F., 195, *Stonleigh Park Road, Ewell, Surrey.*
- Hanna, H. B., *Royal Academical Institution, Belfast.*
- Hardie, C. G., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
- Hardy, Prof. G. H., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Hardy, H. H., *Kingsland House, Shrewsbury.*
- Harmsworth, C., 13, *Hyde Park Gardens, W. 2.*
- Harris, A. C., *Griswollen, 60, Dreilindenstr., Lucerne, Switzerland.*
- Harris, C. R. S., *All Souls College, Oxford.*
- Harris, L. C., 'Hellas,' *Astley Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham.*
- Harrison, A. R. W., *Merton College, Oxford.*
- Harrison, C. M., *Twycross, Godalming, Surrey.*
- †Harrison, E., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Hart, Dr. B., 1, *Harcourt House, Cavendish Square, W. 1.*
- Harte, R. H., *Bartra, Fortwilliam Drive, Belfast.*
- Hartley, Miss M., *Somerille College, Oxford.*
- †Hasluck, Mrs. F. W., *Poste Restante, Elbasan, Albania.*
- Hasluck, P. P., *Mead House, Westcott, Dorking.*
- Hawthorn, J. R., *Trinity College, Glenalmond, Perthshire.*
- Haynes, D. E. L., 44, *Madeley Road, Ealing, W. 5.*
- Heald, Rev. B., *The Grammar School, Midhurst, Sussex.*
- Heap, G. V. M., *Buckland House, Lymington, Hants.*
- Heath, P. R. L., 40, *Scarsdale Villas, W. 3.*
- Heath, Sir Thomas L., K.C.B., K.C.V.O., F.B.A., 64, *Bedford Gardens, W. 3.*
- Heithaus, The Rev. C. H., S.J., 6, *Endleigh Street, W.C. 1.*
- Hemp, W. J., 9, *Rodway Road, S.W. 15.*
- Henderson, H. L., *New College, Oxford.*
- Henderson, Mrs. M. I., c/o Mrs. Munro, *The Rector's Lodgings, Lincoln College, Oxford.*
- Henniker-Gotley, Rev. G., *Wivelsfield Vicarage, Haywards Heath, Sussex.*
- Herzfelder, H., c/o Royal Bank of Canada, *Rue Scribe, Paris.*

- Hett, W. S., *Durnford House, Eastern Road, Brighton*.
- Hickie, E. Wynne, 23, *Menlove Avenue, Liverpool*, 18.
- Hicks, F. M.
- Higham, T. F., *Trinity College, Oxford*.
- Hignett, C., *Tal-y-Fan, Penmaenmawr, N. Wales*.
- Hiley, F. C. W., *British Museum, W.C.* 1.
- Hill, Mrs. B. H., 9, *Plutarch Street, Athens, Greece*.
- †Hill, Sir George, K.C.B., F.B.A., 12, *Sussex Place, Regent's Park, N.W.* 1.
- Hill, Mrs. G. F., *The Executors of, 12, Sussex Place, Regent's Park, N.W.* 1.
- Hill, Miss R. M., 30, *Torrington Square, W.C.* 1.
- Hillard, F. P. N., *Puriton Lodge, Hambrook, Chichester*.
- Hinks, R. P., *British Museum, W.C.* 1.
- Hirst, Prof. Miss G., *Barnard College, Columbia University, New York*.
- Hirst, Miss M. E., 114a, *Gough Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham*.
- Hobling, Miss M. B., *Hillside, Lostwithiel, Cornwall*.
- Hobson, C. M., '*The Derbyshire Advertiser*,' *Market Place, Derby*.
- Hodges, H. W., *Royal Naval College, Dartmouth*.
- Hodgson, Miss U., 20, *Corder Road, Ipswich*.
- Hogarth, Miss M. I., *Littlewick Green, Maidenhead*.
- Holding, Miss G. E., '*Saxon*,' *North Lane, Rustington, Sussex*.
- †Holley, Miss N. M., 79, *Siridar Road, Southampton*.
- Holloway, Miss H. M., 14, *Highwood Avenue, N.* 12.
- Holloway, Rev. W. J., *St. Mary's Vicarage, Newbury*.
- Holmes, M., *Willow Clough, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks*.
- †Holroyd, M., *Brasenose College, Oxford*.
- Holt, A. J., 42, *Ruabon Road, Didsbury, Manchester*, 20.
- Homann-Wedeking, Frau E., *Deutsches Archael. Inst.*, 79, *Via Sardegna, Rome*.
- Hoorn, Dr. G. Van, 5, *Ramstraat, Utrecht, Holland*.
- Hopkins, T. H. C., *Woodyard Cottage, Ashridge, Berkhamsted, Herts*.
- Hopkinson, The Ven. Archdeacon J. H., *Winsten Vicarage, Windermere, Westmorland*.
- Hornsby, Miss H. M., 81, *Wellington Road, Dublin*.
- †Horsfall, Miss K. M., 38, *Redcliffe Gardens, S.W.* 10.
- Hose, H. F., 35, *Silverwood Avenue, Newton Abbot, Devon*.
- House, H. H., *Acie End, Eynsham, Oxford*.
- How, F. W., *Eton College, Windsor*.
- How, Rev. J. H., 20, *North Bailey, Durham*.
- Howat, A. P., *The High School, Hawick, Roxburghshire*.
- Hunt, A. J., *The Mill House, Bradfield*.
- Hunt, D. W. S., *Magdalen College, Oxford*.
- Hunter, P. G., *Stowe School, Buckingham*.
- Huntington, Rev. G. H., *Robert College, Bebek, P.O. Box 8, Istanbul, Turkey*.
- Hutchinson, R. W., *The Orchard, Harston, Cambs*.
- †Hyde, J. H., 18, *Rue Adophe-Lyon, Paris*.
- Iliffe, J. H., *The Palestine Museum, Dept. of Antiquities, Jerusalem, Palestine*.
- Inglefield, G. S., *Lilies, Windley, Derby*.
- Ions, Miss C. M., *Tall Oak, Church Avenue, Ruislip, Middlesex*.
- Irvine, A. L., *Pageites, Charterhouse, Godalming*.
- Irwin-Carruthers, G., *City of London School, E.C.* 4.
- Jackson, L. T., 32, *Fale Court, Honeybourne Road, N.W.* 6.
- †James, A. G., *Upwood, Abingdon, Berks*.
- James, R. L., *The High House, Brook Green, W.* 6.
- Jameson, R., 8, *Avenue Velasquez, Paris*.
- †Jarman, Mrs. C. A., 4, *Fulthorpe Road, Norton-on-Tees, Co. Durham*.
- Jasper, L. D., 15, *Overbury Avenue, Beckenham, Kent*.
- Jeffery, Miss L. H., *Eastnor, Sydenham Villas Rd., Cheltenham*.
- Jelf, Miss G. E., *St. Mary's Cottage, Waxwell Lane, Pinner*.
- Jenkins, Miss C. K., 8, *Eton Road, N.W.* 3.
- Jenkins, E. D. T., *University College of Wales, Aberystwyth*.
- Jenkins, R. J. H., *Emmanuel College, Cambridge*.
- †Jervoise, Miss F. H., *Targett's Farm, Arborfield, Reading*.
- †Jex-Blake, Miss K., 4, *Airlie Gardens, W.* 8.
- †Johnson, Miss L. A., *Western, The Firs, Bowdon, Cheshire*.
- Johnson, Miss T. O. B., *Salaam, West Lodge Avenue, W.* 3.
- Jolliffe, Miss N. C., *Girton College, Cambridge*.
- Jolowicz, Prof. H. F., 9, *Ferncroft Avenue, N.W.* 3.
- Jones, A. H. M., 3, *Park Crescent, Oxford*.
- Jones, F. W. O., *New College, Oxford*.
- †Jones, Sir Henry Stuart, F.B.A., 3, *Rock Terrace, Tenby, S. Wales*.
- †Jones, H., 27, *Avenue Road, N.W.* 8.
- †Jones, R. P., 24, *Hornton Street, W.* 8.
- Jongkees, J. H., *Gen. de la Rey laan 17, Bussum, Holland*.
- Joseph, H. W. B., F.B.A., *New College, Oxford*.
- Kahnweiler, Miss B., 2, *Mercer Circle, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*

- Keen, Miss E. A., 7, *Williams' Park*, Rathmines, Dublin.
- †Keen, H. H., *Edgehill*, Limpsfield, Surrey.
- Keith-Falconer, A. W., 80, *Cudogon Square*, S.W. 1.
- Kelland, G. T., 66, *Hillway*, Highgate, N. 6.
- Kemball-Cook, B. H., *Repton*, Derby.
- Kemp, J. N., 83, *Cromwell Road South*, Whitstable, Kent.
- Kenion, T. D., *Holmfild*, Darlington Road, Barnard Castle, Co. Durham.
- Kennedy, W. R., *Hughenden Cottage*, Hughenden, High Wycombe, Bucks.
- Kenny, E. J. A., 'Topolia', *Pierce Lane*, Fulbourn, Cambridge.
- Kent, F. L., *British Museum*, W.C. 1.
- Kenward, H. S., 'Charnwood', *New Forest Lane*, Chigwell.
- Kenyon, Sir Frederic, G.B.E., K.C.B., F.B.A., *Kirkstead*, Godstone, Surrey.
- Kenyon, J. B., *Taunton School*, Taunton, Somerset.
- Ker, Rev. R. E., 37, *Rugby Road*, Belfast.
- Kermode, Miss H. S., 22, *Abercromby Square*, Liverpool.
- Killick, H. J., 151, *Pilton Place*, S.E. 17.
- Kilpatrick, Rev. G. D., 6, *Waldens Park Road*, Horsell, Woking.
- Kinchin-Smith, F., 11B, *Bishops Wood Road*, N. 6.
- King, A. H., *Dept. of Printed Books*, British Museum, W.C. 1.
- King, J. E., *West House*, Chilton Polden, Nr. Bridgwater.
- King, Sir Wilfred Creyke, *The Chalet*, Nepean Street, Roehampton, S.W. 15.
- Kingdom, T., *School House*, Wyggeston Boys' School, Leicester.
- Kipling, P. F., 17, *Aigburth Drive*, Liverpool.
- Kipling, Mrs., 17, *Aigburth Drive*, Liverpool.
- Kirkby, R. N., 40, *Dunbar Crescent*, Southport.
- Kirto, H. D. F., 4, *Southpark Avenue*, Glasgow, W. 2.
- Knight, Miss C. M., 6, *Foires Gardens*, Finchley Road, N.W. 11.
- Knight, W. F. J., *Great Duiyard Hall*, Exeter, Devon.
- Labram, G. W., 74, *Kilmartin Avenue*, S.W. 16.
- Laing, Miss J. M., 35, *Chatsworth Way*, W. Norwood.
- Laird, Prof. J., *Powis Lodge*, Old Aberdeen.
- Laistner, Prof. M. L. W., 4, *Boardman Hall*, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.
- †Lamb, Mrs. E., *Holly Lodge*, Campden Hill, W. 8.
- Lamb, Miss W., *Holly Lodge*, Campden Hill, W. 8.
- †Lamb, W. R. M., C.V.O., *Elm House*, Ellison Road, S.W. 13.
- Lambart, J. H. L., *Godolphin House*, Eton College, Windsor.
- Lane, E. A., 64, *Queen's Gardens*, W. 2.
- Langford, F. C. G., 35, *Alleyne Park*, S.E. 21.
- Last, Prof. H. M., *Brasenose College*, Oxford.
- Law, H. W., *Showells*, Chaucer Road, Cambridge.
- Lawrence, A. W., 11, *Woburn Square*, W.C. 1.
- †Lawrence, J. W.
- Lawrence, Miss M., 4, *Gordon Square*, W.C. 1.
- Lawrence, T., 14, *Montpelier Crescent*, Brighton.
- Lee, Miss S., *The Ludlow*, Copley Square, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
- Lees, Miss M. E., 2, *Penralet Road*, (Upper) Bangor, N. Wales.
- Le Fanu, W. R., *Chart Corner*, Seal Chart, Nr. Sevenoaks.
- Legg, L. G. W., *New College*, Oxford.
- Lepper, F. A., *Redgrove*, Hester's Way, Nr. Cheltenham.
- Letts, M., 27, *West Heath Drive*, N.W. 11.
- Levy, Miss G. R., 40, *Rotherwick Road*, N.W. 11.
- †Lewis, J. Spedan, *Leckford Abbess*, Stockbridge, Hants.
- Lewis, Mrs. Spedan, *Leckford Abbess*, Stockbridge, Hants.
- Lewis, L. W. P., *The Old Vicarage*, Peter's Marland, N. Devon.
- Lewis, Miss M. B. Rice, O.B.E., 40, *Guessens Court*, Welwyn Garden City, Herts.
- Lewisohn, F., *East India United Service Club*, 16, St. James Square, S.W. 1.
- Lidderdale, D. W. S., 11, *Roxburgh Mansions*, Kensington Court, W. 8.
- Limebeer, Miss D. E., Flat 3a, 5, *Ferndale*, Tunbridge Wells.
- Lindsell, Miss A., 35, *Adamson Road*, N.W. 3.
- Linton, Lt.-Col. S. F., *The Old Mill*, Cloughton, Nr. Scarborough.
- †Lister, E., *Upton House*, Bathwick Hill, Bath.
- Lister, Capt. J. C. F., 2, *Brynellen Court*, Prince Edwards Road, Lewes, Sussex.
- Little, B. D. G., *The Secretary's Dept.*, The Admiralty, Whitehall, S.W. 1.
- Livingstone, Sir Richard, *Corpus Christi College*, Oxford.
- Llewellyn Smith, J. C., 86, *Grove Hill Road*, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.
- Lloyd, Miss M. E. H., 7, *Manor Court*, Pinehurst, Cambridge.
- Lloyd-Baker, A. B., *Devonshire House*, Bath Road, Cheltenham.
- Locket, Mrs. G. H., 36, *Gayton Road*, Harrow.
- Lockwood, F. W., 5, *Holmeade Avenue*, S.E. 24.
- Lockwood, J. F., *Knowle Green*, 193, *Stagford Road*, Caterham.
- Lodge, Miss L., c/o *Bank of Australasia*, 4, Threadneedle Street, E.C. 2.
- Lofthouse, W. F., *Friary Road*, Handsworth Wood, Birmingham.

- Longford, Right Hon. The Countess of, 123, *Leinster Road, Rathmines, Dublin.*
- Looseley, C. A., 8, *Thornsett Road, S.E.* 20.
- Lord, Prof. L. E., *Oberlin College, U.S.A.*
- Lorimer, Miss H. L., *Somerille College, Oxford.*
- Low, Miss J. I., *Blebo, Cupar, Fife.*
- Lowe, Miss D. A., *The Old Malt House, Hinton St. George, Creckkerne, Somerset.*
- Lowe, Miss L. A., *The Old Malt House, Hinton St. George, Creckkerne, Somerset.*
- Lucas, Miss C., 47, *Palace Court, W.* 2.
- Lucas, D. W., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- Lucas, F. L., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- +Luce, Dr. S. B., 267, *Clarendon Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Lupton, Miss E. G., *Beechwood, Elmete Lane, Roundhay, Leeds,* 8.
- Lynam, A. E., *School House, Bardwell Road, Oxford.*
- Lyon, P. H. B., *The Edinburgh Academy, Edinburgh.*
- MacAlister, Lady, 27, *Well Walk, N.W.* 3.
- *Macan, R. W., *Broom Hill, Berks. Nr. Oxford.*
- McArthur, Mrs., *Teme House, Cheltenham.*
- McCutcheon, Miss K. H., 12, *Lancaster Close, St. Petersburg Place, W.C.* 1.
- McDonald, A. H., *University College, Nottingham.*
- Macdonald, Sir George, K.C.B., F.B.A., 17, *Learmouth Gardens, Edinburgh.*
- Macdonald, J., *Milfiach, Kirkhill, Inverness-shire.*
- Macdonald, Miss Louisa, 42, *Ordnance Road, N.W.* 8.
- McDonald, Prof. W. F., *Dept. of History, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.*
- McDonnell, H. C., *Glenmorven, Onich, Inverness-shire.*
- Macdonnell, Sir Philip, *Woodlyn, Gatehouse-of-Fleet, Galloway, Scotland.*
- McElderry, Prof. R. K., *Glenside, 34, Sans Souci Park, Belfast.*
- MacEwen, R. B., *c/o Grindlay & Co., 54, Parliament Street, S.W.* 1.
- Macgregor, D. C., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- Machin, M. I., *Cranleigh School, Surrey.*
- McIntosh, A. J., 117, *Brownlow Road, N.* 11.
- Mackay, Mrs., 88, *Exeter House, Putney Heath, S.W.* 15.
- McKenzie, Rev. H. W., 25, *Winchester Road, Oxford.*
- +Mackinnon, Miss Katharine A., *Armadillo Castle, by Oban, Argyll.*
- +McLachlan, Mrs., 89, *Queen's Court, W.* 2.
- Macmillan, Mrs. G. A., 27, *Queen's Gate Gardens, S.W.* 7.
- †Macmillan, W. E. F., 44, *Onslow Square, S.W.* 7.
- Macnaughten, D. A., *Oakdene, Bishops Avenue, N.* 2.
- Macpherson, Mrs. A. W., *c/o Coutts & Co., 440, Strand, W.C.* 2.
- Macurdy, Prof. Miss G. H., 38, *Lexham Gardens, W.* 8.
- Malcolm, D. O., *Rhodesia House, 2, London Wall Buildings, E.C.* 2.
- †Malim, F. B., *Wellington College, Berks.*
- Mallin, Miss R. D., *Canton House, Godmanchester, Huntingdon.*
- Mander-Jones, E., *Sydney Church of England Grammar School, North Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.*
- Mann, C. W., 39, *Esmond Gardens, W.* 4.
- Manton, G. R., *Elmhurst, High Road, South Woodford, E.* 18.
- +Marindin, G. E., 19, *Wentley Road, S.W.* 15.
- Marriage, Miss E. G., *Thresholds, Tyrrells Wood, Leatherhead, Surrey.*
- Marshall, Prof. F. H., 20, *Somali Road, N.W.* 2.
- Marshall, Sir John, C.I.E., F.B.A., *'Acondale,' Sydney Road, Guildford.*
- Martienssen, Rex, *c/o Stanley Casson, Esq., New College, Oxford.*
- Martin, Miss G. E. G., *Kendrick Girls' School, Reading.*
- Martin, J. M., 9, *Correnie Gardens, Edinburgh.*
- Martin, Rev. P. J., 99, *Dixon's Green, Dudley, Wores.*
- Martin, V. C., *The Foxhills, Wombourne, Wolverhampton.*
- †Martineau, R. C., 2, *Common Lane, Eton College, Windsor.*
- Martinij, Dr. G., 31, *Bedford Way, W.C.* 1.
- Mason, P. G., *Christowce, Cheltenham.*
- Matheson, Canon F. W., *Trinity College, Glenalmond, Perthshire.*
- Matheson, P. E., 3, *Brookside, Headington, Oxford.*
- Matthews, J. L., 9, *Jackson's Lane, N.* 6.
- Mattingly, H., *British Museum, W.C.* 1.
- Mavrogordato, J. N., 7, *Avenue Close, Avenue Road, N.W.* 8.
- Mavrogordato, J. J., *Gilridge, Eden Bridge, Kent.*
- Mavrogordato, T. M., 30, *Hyde Park Gardens, W.* 2.
- Mavnard, Rev. Preb. H., *The Parsonage, Milverton, Somerset.*
- Mayor, H. B., *Bicknoller, Taunton.*
- Mayor, R. J. G., 35, *Camden Hill Gardens, W.* 8.
- Mead, Miss L. M., 133, *Thurleigh Road, S.W.* 12.
- Medley, R. P., *Lately, Bulstrode Way, Gerrard's Cross, Bucks.*
- Meek, J., *Pennings, Hocroft Avenue, N.W.* 2.
- Megaw, A. H. S., *Arden, 3, Fortwilliam Drive, Belfast.*

- Meigars, R., *Keeble College, Oxford.*
- Meiklejohn, K. W., *St. John's School, Leatherhead, Surrey.*
- Meiklejohn, Lady, 10, *Culford Mansions, S.W. 3.*
- Meiklejohn, Sir Rodrick, K.B.E., C.B., 22, *Connaught Square, W. 2.*
- †Miers, Sir Henry, F.R.S., 18, *Aberdare Gardens, N.W. 6.*
- Millar, C. M. H., *Trinity College, Glenalmond, Perthshire.*
- Miller, Miss G. L., 69, *Grosvenor Street, W. 1.*
- Miller, W., F.B.A., 8, *Rue Bessarion, Athens.*
- Milligan, W. M., *Eton College, Windsor.*
- Millington, Miss M. V., 30, *Peak Hill, S.E. 26.*
- Mills, Miss S. B., *The Vicarage, Petersham, Surrey.*
- †Milne, H. J. M., *British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- Milne, J. G., 23, *Belsyre Court, Oxford.*
- Milne, Mrs. J. G., 23, *Belsyre Court, Oxford.*
- Minns, Prof. E. H., F.B.A., *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*
- Mischler, Mrs. H. M., *Trewinnard Court, Turo.*
- †Mitatanga, M. A., 23, *Rue Sylvabelle, Mar-seilles.*
- Mitchell, Miss J. T., 246, *Waterloo Road, Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent.*
- Mitchinson, Mrs., *River Court, Hammersmith Mall, W. 6.*
- Mitford, T. B., *The University, St. Andrews, Fife.*
- Moffat, D. M., 43, *East 75th Street, New York, U.S.A.*
- Mol, W. H., *Methodist College, Belfast.*
- Money-Coutts, Hon. Mercy, *Shipton Lodge, Shipton-under-Wychwood, Oxon.*
- Monk, Robert I., *Quernmore School, Bromley, Kent.*
- Moore, C. H., 9, *King's Bench Walk, E.C. 4.*
- Moore, Mrs. D., 35, *Victoria Avenue, Harrogate, Yorks.*
- Moore, E. C., *Vice-President and Provost, University of California, Los Angeles, U.S.A.*
- Morrissey, Rev. H., *St. Joseph's, Reddish, Stockport.*
- Morrison, J. S., 34, *Stanhope Gardens, S.W. 7.*
- Morse, D. V., 14, *Airlie Gardens, W. 3.*
- Moule, G. W. H., *Damerham Vicarage, Salisbury.*
- Mowinkel, Mme. C., *Villa Rose de France, Monte Carlo, Principality of Monaco.*
- Muehl, Prof. Dr. Von der, *Hardstr. 99, Basle, Switzerland.*
- Muir, W. E., 20, *Lansdowne Crescent, Glasgow, N.W.*
- Mullens, H. G., *The Red Cottage, Picket Twenty, Andover, Hants.*
- Mulvany, C. M., 21, *Benares Cantonments, India.*
- †Munro, J. A. R., *Lincoln College, Oxford.*
- †Murphy, Rev. J. M., *Newman College, University of Melbourne, Carlton, Victoria, Australia.*
- Murray, Prof. G. G. A., F.B.A., *Fatcombe, Boars Hill, Oxford.*
- Murray, H. P. W., *Bramble Hill Lodge, Nr. Lyndhurst.*
- Murray, J., 3, *Pennsylvania Park, Exeter.*
- †Murray, Miss S. W., *Moore Park, Cardross, Dumbartonshire.*
- †Muto, K., *Kwannon-Boyashi, Suniyoshi, Nr. Kobe, Japan.*
- Mynors, R. A. B., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- †Myres, Prof. J. L., O.B.E., F.B.A., 13, *Canterbury Road, Oxford.*
- Nachmanson, Prof. E., *Viktoriagatan 26, Goteborg 3, Sweden.*
- †Nairn, Rev. Dr. J. A., *Stubbings Vicarage, Nr. Maidenhead.*
- Nash, A. B., 16, *Campden Road, South Croydon.*
- Nash, Miss G., 2, *Wadham Gardens, N.W. 3.*
- Nash, P. E., 16, *Campden Road, South Croydon.*
- †Nathan, Major H. L., 35, *Wilton Crescent, S.W. 1.*
- Neill, W. C. H., 18, *Pym Road, Mexborough, Nr. Rotherham.*
- Nelson, K. E., *Allendale, Manor Drive, Harrogate, Yorks.*
- Neville, Miss A., 7, *Mulberry Walk, Chelsea, S.W.*
- Newall, H. F., *Madingley Rise, Cambridge.*
- †Newall, E. T., *c/o The American Numismatic School, Broadway and 156th Street, New York.*
- Newton, The Lord, 75, *Eaton Square, S.W. 1.*
- Neylan, D., *The School, Dartington Hall, Totnes, South Devon.*
- Niemeyer, Sir Otto, *Treasury Chambers, S.W. 1.*
- Nock, Prof. A. D., K-21, *Eliot House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
- Norris, F. E., *High Close, Holford Road, N.W. 3.*
- Norwood, Sir Cyril, *St. John's College, Oxford.*
- †Norwood, Prof. G., *University of Toronto, Canada.*
- Oake, W., 27, *Stanley Gardens, N.W. 3.*
- Oakeshort, Mrs. W. F., *St. Paul's School, W. 14.*
- Oakley, H. C., 22, *Ouseley Road, S.W. 12.*
- Oates, J. C. T., 2, *Portugal Place, Cambridge.*
- †Ogilvie, F. W., 33, *Elstworthy Road, N.W. 3.*
- O'Hanlon, G., *Westcott House, Sherborne, Dorset.*
- Oldaker, The Rev. W. H., *Cathedral Choir House, Oxford.*
- Oliver, Prof. James H., 435 *West 119th Street, New York, U.S.A.*
- Oliver, Prof. John R., 1900 *E. Monument St., Baltimore, U.S.A.*
- O'Neill, B. H. St. J., 14, *Crescent Road, Beckenham, Kent.*
- O'Neill, Rev. J. G., *St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland.*

- Onians, Prof. R. B., *The Waco, Cokes Lane, Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks.*
- Oram, Miss G. M., 46, *Hills Avenue, Cambridge.*
- Orbeliani, Col. Prince R., *Corn Exchange Bank, 360, Park Avenue, New York, U.S.A.*
- Ormerod, Prof. H. A., 25, *Rodney Street, Liverpool.*
- Osborn, Miss M., *Milton Rectory, Cambridge.*
- Owen, A. S., *Kible College, Oxford.*
- Ozanne, R. T., 69, *Hauteville, Guernsey, Channel Islands.*
- Page, D. L., *Christ Church, Oxford.*
- Palmer, Mrs. C. M. A., Flat 6, 69, *Courtfield Gardens, S.W. 5.*
- Parke, Prof. H. W., 9, *Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.*
- Parker, H. M. D., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
- Parkin, Miss G. I., 6, *Ellison Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne.*
- Parsons, L. A. M., *Gresham School, Holt, Norfolk.*
- Pascoe, Miss M., *Bracken Hill, Woking, Surrey.*
- Paterson, G. M., *The College, Cheltenham.*
- †Paton, J. M., c/o Morgan & Co., 14, *Place Vendome, Paris 1^{re}.*
- Paton, Miss L. A., c/o Morgan & Co., 14, *Place Vendome, Paris 1^{re}.*
- Patrick, Dr. M. Mills, *Hotel President, Palo Alto, California, U.S.A.*
- Pearman, A. E., *Queenwood, Dalkeith Road, Bournemouth.*
- Pearson, Prof. L. I. C., 2791, *Yale Station, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.*
- Peck, Dr. A. L., *Christ's College, Cambridge.*
- †Peckover, Hon. Alexandrina, *Bank House, Wisbech.*
- Pelly, Mrs. N., *Abbots Grange, Bebington, Cheshire.*
- Pember, F. W., *Broncroft Castle, Craven Arms, Shropshire.*
- †Pendlebury, J. D. S., 31, *Barrow Road, Cambridge.*
- Pendlebury, Mrs. H. W., 31, *Barrow Road, Cambridge.*
- Pendleton, Rev. M. B., 78, *Athelstan Road, Clive Vale, Hastings.*
- Pennefather, H. W. A., 43, *Princes Gardens, S.W. 7.*
- †Penoyre, J., C.B.E., *The Thatched House, Long Handborough, Nr. Oxford.*
- †Penrose, Dame Emily, 14a, *Belsize Park Gardens, N.W. 3.*
- Percival-Hart, Miss E. M., *Queen Anne's Mansions, St. James's Park, S.W. 1.*
- Perry, R. A., 96, *Parkwood Road, Isleworth, Middlesex.*
- Pertz, Miss F., 35, *Ladbroke Grove, W. 11.*
- Petrocchino, D. P., C.B.E., 25, *Odos Timoleonos, Athens, Greece.*
- Philippou, L., P.O. Box 22, *Paphos, Cyprus.*
- Phillips, Miss C. M., 9, *Sylvan Hill, S.E. 19.*
- Phillips, E. D., 30, *Comwallis Crescent, Clifton, Bristol.*
- Phipps, Miss M. E. A., 64, *Endicell Road, S.E. 4.*
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., F.B.A., *The University, Sheffield, 10.*
- Pickering, T. E., *The Schools, Shrewsbury.*
- Pirie-Gordon, H., 46, *Addison Avenue, W. 11.*
- Pitt, E. J. E., c/o Government Monopolies Dept., *Penang, Straits Settlement.*
- Pitts-Tucker, R. St. J., *The Schools, Shrewsbury.*
- †Platnauer, Maurice, *Brasenose College, Oxford.*
- Plumptre, E. V. C., 2, *Peterborough House, Grove Hill, Harrow.*
- †Podmore, G. C., *Charney Hall, Grange-over-Sands.*
- Pollard, J. R. T., *The Woodstock Hotel, Canterbury Road, Herne Bay, Kent.*
- Porter, Prof. W. H., *Lehenagh House, Cork, Ireland.*
- Powell, Prof. J. E., *The University, Sydney.*
- Powell, Miss M. H., 30, *Abbey Gardens, N.W. 8.*
- Prendergast, Dr. J., *Charing Cross Hospital, W.C. 2.*
- Prentice, C. H. C., c/o Westminster Bank, 10, *St. Martin's Place, W.C. 2.*
- Preston, Prof. A. W., *The University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada.*
- Price, Miss E. R., 5b, *Crick Road, Oxford.*
- Prickard, A. O., *Scotney Lodge, Fleet R.S.O., Hants.*
- Pryce, F. N., *British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- †Purdie, Rev. A. B., 44, *Sussex Square, Brighton.*
- Purdon, Mrs. H. A., *Aulion, Coombe Park, Kingston Hill, Surrey.*
- Purdon, W. T., 390, *The White House, N.W. 1.*
- Purser, Miss O., *Orchardton, Rathfarnham, Co. Dublin.*
- Pyatt, H. R., 16, *Merchiston Crescent, Edinburgh, 10.*
- Pyddoke, Miss M., 4, *Queen's Gate, S.W. 7.*
- Quirk, Rev. R., *Minster House, Winchester.*
- †Rackham, B., 86, *Higher Drive, Purley, Surrey.*
- †Rackham, H., *Christ's College, Cambridge.*
- Radford, Miss E., *St. Anthony in Roseland, Portscatho, Cornwall.*
- †Raleigh, Miss K., 14, *St. Quentin Avenue, W. 10.*
- Ramsay, A. B., *The Lodge, Magdalene College, Cambridge.*
- †Ramsay, Prof. Sir William, 34, *Wentworth Avenue, Bournemouth.*
- Ramsey, Miss D. W., 43, *Ladbroke Square, W. 11.*

- Randall-MacIver, D., F.B.A., *c/o Messrs. Broken Shipley & Co.*, 123, *Pall Mall, S.W.* 1.
- Rattenbury, R. M., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Raven, E. J. P., *Oak Loden, Eye, Suffolk.*
- Rawson, S. W., 8, *The Sanctuary, Westminster, S.W.* 1.
- †Rendall, Rev. G. H., *Dedham House, Dedham, Colchester.*
- †Rendall, M., *Butley Priory, Woodbridge, Suffolk.*
- Rendall, P. G., *Oxencood, Bushey Heath.*
- Rendall, V. H., 107, *Edith Road, W.* 14.
- Rennell of Rodd, Right Hon. Lord, G.C.M.G., G.C.B., G.C.V.O., 39, *Bryanston Square, W.* 1.
- Rennie, Prof. William, 6, *The College, University of Glasgow, W.* 2.
- Rich, C. G., 'Wealdside,' *Weald Road, Sevenoaks Common, Kent.*
- Rich, Miss O. M., *Rivington, Beaulieu Gardens, N.* 21.
- Richards, Miss S. E. S., *Stockwell College, The Old Palace, Bromley, Kent.*
- Richardson, Miss A. C., 37, *Bedford Gardens, W.* 8.
- Richardson, L. J. D., 'Fernshaw,' *Lake Road West, Cardiff.*
- Richmond, Sir Bruce L., *Netherhampton House, Salisbury.*
- Richmond, Prof. O. L., 5, *Belford Place, Edinburgh.*
- Richter, Miss G. M. A., *Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, U.S.A.*
- Rickatson-Hatt, B., 39, *Orchard Court, Portman Square, W.* 1.
- Rickett, D. H. F., *Hawthorns, Overton Road, Sutton, Surrey.*
- Roberts, G. M., *St. Bees School, St. Bees, Cumberland.*
- Roberts, J. Slingsby, 3, *Powis Villas, Brighton.*
- Robertson, C. M., 56, *Bateman Street, Cambridge.*
- Robertson, Prof. D. S., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Robins, Miss B. T., 34, *Upper Park Road, Hampstead, N.W.* 3.
- Robinson, Prof. C. A., 12, *Keene Street, Providence, R.I., U.S.A.*
- Robinson, C. E., *Culvers Close, Winchester.*
- †Robinson, E. S. G., 23, *Upper Phillimore Gardens, W.* 8.
- Robinson, K. D., *The Lane House, Crowthorne, Berkshire.*
- Robinson, Dr. W., *Carlton House, Sunderland.*
- Rodewald, C. A., *Rosemount, Ryde, Isle of Wight.*
- Rogers, Miss M. D., 3, *Park Drive, N.W.* 11.
- Roos, Prof. Dr. A. G., *Waterloolaan 7, Groningen, Holland.*
- Rose, Prof. H. J., F.B.A., *Edgecliff East, The Scores, St. Andrews, Fife.*
- †Rothschild, A. de, 42, *Hill Street, Berkeley Square, W.* 1.
- †Rouse, W. H. D., *Histon Manor, Cambridge.*
- Rowling, Mrs. M., *Cliffside, Kendall, Westmorland.*
- Rubie, Rev. Canon A. E., *Cottingham Rectory, Market Harborough.*
- Ruddock, C. L., 90, *Lowestoft Road, Gorleston-on-Sea, Suffolk.*
- Rule, R., *Old Berkeley, Homefield Road, Chorley Wood, Herts.*
- Russell, Miss P. M., 14, *Northcote Avenue, W.* 5.
- Russell, T. B., *Radbrook Cottage, Binfield Heath, Henley-on-Thames.*
- Rutherford, H. C., 'The New Order,' *Oakley House, 14-18, Bloomsbury Street, W.C.* 1.
- †Rutherford, Miss H., 17, *Huntly Gardens, Glasgow, W.*
- Sachs, Mrs. G., 26, *Marlborough Hill, N.W.* 8.
- †Salisbury, F. S., *Dorset House, Ashford, Middlesex.*
- Salmon, C., 7, *Manor Road, Romford, Essex.*
- Salter, Mrs. H. de G., *The Crown House, Newport, Essex.*
- Sandbach, F. H., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Sanders, C. W., 30, *Ennerdale Road, Richmond, Surrey.*
- †Sandys, Lady, *Grand Hotel du Lac, Vevey, Vaud, Switzerland.*
- †Sartain, W. J., *Selwyn College, Cambridge.*
- Saunders, A. N. W., *Bradfield College, Berks.*
- †Scarth, Miss E. M., *Turleigh Mill, Bradford-on-Avon.*
- Scheurleer, Prof. C. W. L., *Schuytstraat 55, The Hague, Holland.*
- †Scholderer, J. V., *British Museum, W.C.* 1.
- Schroder, Baroness Bruno, 35, *Park Street, W.* 1.
- Scott, L. H., *Grove House, Leighton Park School, Reading.*
- Scott, R. G., 18, *Oaklands, Argyle Road, W.* 13.
- Scullard, H. H., 52, *Foscote Road, N.W.* 4.
- Seaman, C. M. E., 21a, *Caddington Road, Bedford.*
- Sée, P. H., 3, *Essex Court, Middle Temple, E.C.* 4.
- Seeborn, H., *Poynder's End, Nr. Hitchin.*
- Seltman, C. T., *Queens' College, Cambridge.*
- Sewry, T. F., *The Nook, Lime Avenue, Ripley, Derby.*
- Seymer, Mrs., 30, *Bramham Gardens, S.W.* 5.
- Seymour, P. A., *Jesus College, Oxford.*
- Shaw, Evelyn, M.V.O., 1, *Lowther Gardens, S.W.* 7.
- Shaw, F. H., 66, *The Ridgeway, S.W.* 19.
- Shear, Prof. T. L., 2, *Battle Road, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.*
- Sheepshanks, A. C., *Eton College, Windsor.*
- Sheppard, J. T., *King's College, Cambridge.*

- Sherwin-White, A. N., *St. John's College, Oxford*.
 Shewan, A., *Seagate, St. Andrews, Fife*.
 Shields, Mrs. R. L., 9, *Rue Spontini, Paris XVI^e*.
 Short, G. A., 2, *Great Omond Street, W.C. 1*.
 Silcox, Miss L., *Foxcombe End, Boars Hill, Oxford*.
 Sills, H. H., *Great Shelford, Cambridge*.
 Simkins, R. M., *The Grammar School, Rusholme, Manchester, 13*.
 Sinclair, Miss G. M., 11, *Clifton Gardens, W. 9*.
 †Sinclair, Prof. T. A., 8, *Malone Hill Park, Belfast*.
 †Sing, J. M., *Malthouse, Iffley, Oxford*.
 †Singer, Dr. C., *Kilmarth, Par. Cornwall*.
 Sinker, A. P., *Jesus College, Cambridge*.
 Skeat, T. C., *British Museum, W.C. 1*.
 Skerry, Miss D. M., *Brackenhill, Runfold, Surrey*.
 †Slater, H., *Upton Cross, Callington, Cornwall*.
 Sloane, Miss E., 8, *University Road, Leicester*.
 Sloman, H. N. P., *The School House, Tonbridge*.
 Slijper, Dr. E., *Frederick Hendrikstraat 84, Utrecht, Holland*.
 Smiley, Prof. M. T., *University College, W.C. 1*.
 Smith, Alec H., *New College, Oxford*.
 ‡*Smith, A. H., C.B., F.B.A., 2, *Balfour Road, Weybridge*.
 Smith, C. C. B., 66, *St. James Road, Shirley, Southampton*.
 Smith, Prof. J. A., *Magdalen College, Oxford*.
 Smith, R. E., *Trinity College, Toronto, Canada*.
 Snijder, Prof. Dr. G. A. S., *Allard Prierson Stichting, Weesperzijde 33, Amsterdam (O.), Holland*.
 Snow, Miss P. M., 7, *Hewett Road, Portsmouth*.
 Solon, L. V., 211, *East 35th Street, New York, U.S.A.*
 †Somerset, A., *Castle Goring, Worthing*.
 Somerset, E. J., 20, *Dulwich Common, S.E. 21*.
 South, Miss E. M., 'St. Margaret's,' *Chesterfield Road, Cambridge*.
 SOWELS, Miss G. R., 34, *Acol Court, N.W. 6*.
 Spencer, S. E., 2, *Grove Terrace, N.W. 5*.
 Spencer-Churchill, Capt. E. G., *Northwick Park, Blockley, Worcestershire*.
 Spicer, R. H. S., *The Cottage, Plumpton, Sussex*.
 Spilsbury, A. J., *The Grammar School, Wakefield*.
 †Spranger, J. A., 4, *Via Micheli, Firenze, Italy*.
 Stainton, J. A., 4, *Sussex Square, W. 2*.
 †Staley, Rev. J. E., *The Rectory, Stapleton, Bristol*.
 Stanier, R. S., 137, *Woodstock Road, Oxford*.
 Stannard, H., *Frith End, Bordon, Hants*.
 Stathatos, Mme. H. A., 22, *Rue Hérodote, Athens, Greece*.
 Steele, D. H., *Lake Copais Co. Ltd., Aliartos, Greece*.
 Stein, Sir Arch. K.C.I.E., F.B.A., c/o *The Indian Institute, Oxford*.
 Stevens, C. L., *Magdalen College, Oxford*.
 Stevenson, G. H., *University College, Oxford*.
 Stevenson, J., *Red Tiles, Pretoria Road, Cambridge*.
 Stewart, H. C., *Wayside, Hinksey Hill, Oxford*.
 Stewart, J. C., *Bloomfield, Cragg, Perthshire*.
 Stogdon, Rev. E., *The Vicarage, Harrow*.
 Stokes, J. L., *Charterhouse, Godalming*.
 Stone, C. G., *Balliol College, Oxford*.
 Stott, G., *Chigwell School, Chigwell, Essex*.
 Stout, Prof. G. F., F.B.A., 131, *Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, 9*.
 Street, J. M., *The Schools, Stroudsburg*.
 Strong, Mrs. S. A., C.B.E., 35, *Via Balbo, Rome, Italy*.
 Strudwick, Miss L., *St. Paul's Girls School, Brook Green, W. 6*.
 Swindler, Miss M. H., *Low Buildings, Bryn Mawr, Pa., U.S.A.*
 Sydney-Turner, S. A., 5, *Great James Street, W.C. 1*.
 †Sykes, Sir Percy, K.C.I.E., C.M.G., 18, *Eastbury Court, W. 14*.
 Syme, R., *Trinity College, Oxford*.
 †Symonds, The Rev. H. H., *Wood Close, Grasmere*.
 Taber, Miss A. L., 4, *Woodland Way, Shirley, Croydon*.
 Tait, G. A. D., *Eton College, Windsor*.
 Talbot, J. G., 6, *Earls Avenue, Folkestone*.
 Talbot Rice, Prof. D., *The Pigeon House, Foss Bridge, Nr. Cheltenham*.
 Talcott, Miss L., c/o *The American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece*.
 Talman, J., *Rector of the High School, Glasgow*.
 Tancock, Lt.-Col. A. C., C.I.E., *The Cedars, Springfield Road, Chelmsford, Essex*.
 Tappe, E. D., 2, *Bradmore Way, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, Herts*.
 Tarn, W. W., F.B.A., *Muirtown House, Inverness*.
 †Tarrant, Miss D., *Bedford College, N.W. 1*.
 Taylor, Miss B. Austin, 6, *Oakley Studios, Upper Cheyne Row, S.W. 3*.
 Taylor, C. F., *Clifton College, Bristol*.
 Taylor, Miss M. E. J., *Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey*.
 Tex, Dr. Jan den, 34, *Odos Theotokopoulou, Athens, (8), Greece*.
 †Thackrah, T. H., 3, *Grays Inn Place, W.C. 1*.
 †Thomas, Dr. H., F.B.A., *Dept. of Printed Books, British Museum, W.C. 1*.
 Thomas, Miss H., 161, *Woodstock Road, Oxford*.
 Thomas, Miss M. I., 16, *Crealock Grove, Woodford Green, Essex*.
 Thomas, Miss M. Wynn, 3, *Temple Gardens, E.C. 4*.
 Thomas, Rev. R., 421, *Selsdon Road, Croydon*.
 Thompson, Mrs. D., *Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, 5, Canada*.

- Thompson, Sir Herbert, 1, *Bathwick Hill, Bath*.
- *Thompson, M. S., *Highlands, Redhill, Surrey*.
- Thomson, B., *Etonhurst School, Ashcott, Nr. Bridgewater*.
- Thomson, G., *Corrib Lodge, Galway, Ireland*.
- Thomson, Prof. J. A. K., *King's College, W.C. 2*.
- Thomson, Prof. J. O., *The University, Birmingham*.
- Thursfield, Dr. J. H., *Beechwood, Cliddesden Road, Basingstoke*.
- Tidswell, W. J., *Kingswood School, Bath*.
- Tierney, J. J., *Dept. of Ancient Classics, University College, Dublin*.
- Tierney, Prof. M., *University College, Dublin*.
- Tilden, F., *Ledgewood, Warner, New Hampshire, U.S.A.*
- Till, W. P., *Culday Grange Grammar School, West Kirby, Wirral, Cheshire*.
- Tilly, Miss B., *The High School, Ely, Cambs.*
- Tillyard, Mrs. E. M. W., *Merton House, Cambridge*.
- Tillyard, Prof. H. J. W., *University College, Cardiff*.
- Timberlake, R. R., 31, *Hillmorton Road, Rugby*.
- Tod, J. C., 19, *Norham Road, Oxford*.
- *Tod, M. N., F.B.A., *Oriel College, Oxford*.
- Towne, Miss M., *Holbeche, Braywick Road, Maidenhead, Berks.*
- Toynbee, Prof. A. J., F.B.A., 3, *Melma Place, N.W. 8.*
- Toynbee, Miss J., *Newnham College, Cambridge*.
- Tredegar, Right Hon. Viscount, *Tredegar Park, Newport, Monmouthshire*.
- Tredennick, G. H., 20, *Mount Park Crescent, Ealing*.
- Trendall, A. D., *Trinity College, Cambridge*.
- Treston, Prof. H. J., *University College, Cork*.
- Tristram, Rev. H., *The Oratory School, Caversham*.
- †Truro, The Rt. Rev. the Bishop of, *Lis Escop, Truro, Cornwall*.
- Tucker, G. M., 7, *Elm Road, Wembley, Middlesex*.
- Tucker, N. W. G., 9, *Mount Park Crescent, W. 5.*
- Tudeer, L. O. T., *Oksaenk 4A, Helsinki, Finland*.
- Turberville, G., *Tower House, Grove Park Road, S.E. 9.*
- †Turnbull, Mrs. P., *Sandy-Brook Hall, Ashbourne*.
- Turner, E. G., 30, *Whitworth Road, Sheffield, 10.*
- Turner, G. C., *Marlborough College, Wilts.*
- Turton, Miss D. O., *Biantholme, Millans Park, Ambleside, Westmorland*.
- Turton, G. E., *The Hall, Kildale, Yorkshire*.
- Upcott, G. C., C.B., 13, *Bishopswood Road, N. 6.*
- Ure, Prof. P. N., *The University, Reading*.
- Ure, Mrs. P. N., *The University, Reading*.
- Van Buren, Prof. A. W., *American Academy, Porta S. Pancrazio, Rome, 29, Italy*.
- Van Rensburg, J. P., *P.O. Hoogekruaal, Via Morgenzon, Transvaal, S. Africa*.
- †Vaughan, E. L., *Eton College, Windsor*.
- Venizelos, Madame, H. S., 22, *Rue Beaujou, Paris, VIII^e*.
- Vere Hodge, H. S., *Hightrees, Tonbridge, Kent*.
- †Virtue-Tebbs, Miss H. M., *The Old Church House, Woodstock, Oxon.*
- Vlasto, Madame J. Serpieri, 'Tour la Reine,' 19, *Rue Edouard Law, Athens, Greece*.
- Vogel, C. E., *Tauntons, Whyteleafe Road, Caterham, Surrey*.
- Wace, Prof. A. J. B., 26, *Millington Road, Cambridge*.
- Wace, Miss J., *St. Winifred's, Bath*.
- *Wackernagel, Prof. J., 93, *Gartenstr., Basle, Switzerland*.
- Waddell, Prof. W. G., *Faculty of Arts, Giza, Cairo, Egypt*.
- Waddington, C. W., C.I.E., M.V.O., 156, *Sloane Street, S.W. 3.*
- Waddy, L. H., 92, *York Mansions, Battersea Park, S.W. 11.*
- Wade-Gery, H. T., *Wadham College, Oxford*.
- Wakefield, E. B., *c/o Grindlay's Bank, Lahore, Punjab, India*.
- Wakefield, Miss M. K., 4, *Cavendish Crescent, Bath*.
- Walbank, F. W., *The University, Liverpool*.
- Walde, E. H. Stewart, *Chigwell School, Essex*.
- Walker, Rev. E. M., *Queen's College, Oxford*.
- Walker, G. W. H., 10, *Queen Anne Terrace, Cambridge*.
- Wallace, A. Ross, *Sherborne School, Dorset*.
- Wallace, W. P., 977, *Seventh Street, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.*
- Walsh, Rev. J. A., *Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio, U.S.A.*
- Wanklyn, Miss H., 'Maryland,' 67, *Grange Road, Cambridge*.
- Ward, Miss M. C. L., *St. Columba's School, Kilmacolm, Renfrewshire*.
- Ward, Miss S., *Clare Cottage, Queen's Road, Colchester*.
- Warmington, Prof. E. H., 48, *Flower Lane, N.W. 7.*
- Warner, R. Townsend, 34, *Cranley Gardens, S.W. 7.*
- Warre-Cornish, F. H., 45, *Addison Avenue, W. 11.*
- Warrick, P. P., 1, *The Orchard, Blackheath, S.E. 3.*
- Waterhouse, L. K., *Overshot, Hinksey Hill, Oxford*.
- Watkins, A. R. D., *Collingsbourne, Adlestone, Surrey*.
- Watson, J. H., *Fort-les-Bains, Amélie-les-Bains, Pyrénées Orientales, France*.

- Watson Taylor, Mrs. L. E., *Ditchlings, Roundabouts, Nr. Storrington, Sussex.*
- Wauchope, Miss G. M., 5, *Brunswick Place, Hove, Sussex.*
- Way, A. G., 60, *Ridgway Place, S.W. 19.*
- Way, R. E., *Grey Home, Binkley, Nr. Newmarket.*
- †Weber, Dr. F. P., 13, *Harley Street, W. 1.*
- †Webster, Prof. T. B. L., 15, *Rusholme Gardens, Manchester.*
- Wedd, N., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- Weech, W. N., *Greenfields, The Park, Cheltenham.*
- Wellesley, K., *Moorside, Frankland Road, Croyley Green, Herts.*
- Welsh, Miss S., *Villa Budde, Feldafing am Starnbergersee, Bavaria.*
- Westaway, Miss K. M., *The High School, Bedford.*
- †Westlake, H. D., *Holymoorside, Brough, E. Yorks.*
- Westrup, J. A., 61, *Chatsworth Road, S.E. 27.*
- Wharton, L. C., 31, *Greville Road, N.W. 6.*
- Whibley, L., *The Dial House, Frensham, Farnham, Surrey.*
- White, C. M., *The Copse, Northwood, Middlesex.*
- Whitehorn, A. D., *Collinson House, N.W. 7.*
- Whitehouse, Miss A. D., 57, *West Hill Road, S.W. 18.*
- Whiteley, J. L., 11, *Compton Road, Addiscombe, Surrey.*
- Whiteley, Prof. S., *University College, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- Whittaker, Miss M., *Westfield College, N.W. 3.*
- Whitworth, A. W., *The Culls, Stroud, Glos.*
- Whyte, Miss J., *The High School, Kettering.*
- Wigram, Rev. Canon W. A., *Green Acres, Wells, Somerset.*
- Wilkinson, Miss B., 52, *Dunstan Road, N.W. 11.*
- Wilkinson, Miss G. A., *The Wall House, Eton College, Windsor.*
- Wilkinson, L. P., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- †Willans, J. B., *Dolforan, Kerry, Montgomeryshire.*
- Williams, Rev. A. T. P., *The Deane, Christ Church, Oxford.*
- Williams, I., *Friars School, Bangor.*
- †Williams, R., 8, *Old Roar Road, St. Leonards-on-Sea.*
- Williams, R. Allport, 1, *Verulam Buildings, Grays Inn, W.C. 1.*
- Williamson, Miss E., *Mount Muscul Farm, North Cray, Kent.*
- Wilson, Lt.-Col. H. C. B., *West Stratton House, Nr. Winchester.*
- Wing, H., 429, *West South Street, Carlisle, Pa., U.S.A.*
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P., 9, *Evesham Road, Reigate, Surrey.*
- †Witt, R. E., *Royal Liberty School, Hoare Hall, Romford, Essex.*
- Wolferstan, D. P., 28, *Coram Street, W.C. 1.*
- Wood, A. H., *Romeyns Court, Great Milton, Oxford.*
- Wood, Miss C. D., 9, *Lucerne Road, Orpington, Kent.*
- †Wood, J. C., 4, *Carlisle Place, Manningham, Bradford, Yorks.*
- Wood, Miss M. R., 44, *Kent Gardens, W. 13.*
- Woodcock, T. A., *Boys' Grammar School, Ashby-de-la-Zouche.*
- Woodhouse, C. A., 39, *Cholmeley Park, N. 6.*
- Woodward, Miss A., *Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.*
- Woodward, A. M., 395, *Fulwood Road, Sheffield.*
- Woodward, Mrs. A. M., 395, *Fulwood Road, Sheffield.*
- Woodward, W. H., 48, *Campden Hill Gate, W. 8.*
- Woolley, Sir Leonard, 12, *Royal Avenue, S.W. 3.*
- Wootton, R. W. F., *Luttergate, Kings School, Canterbury.*
- Wormald, F. L., *Ministry of Agriculture, Whitehall Place, S.W. 1.*
- Wormall, D. E. W., *University College, Singleton Park, Swansea.*
- Worth, J. G., 51, *The Drive, Fulham Road, S.W. 6.*
- Wiatalslaw, Miss U. E. L., *Highfield, Oxhey, Herts.*
- Wright, R. P., *Newton Tony Rectory, Salisbury.*
- Wycherley, R. E., 12, *Union Street, Hadley, Shropshire.*
- Wykes, J. C., 3, *Albert Terrace, Musselburgh.*
- Yeatman, F. D., 4, *Crown Office Row, Inner Temple, E.C. 4.*
- York, His Grace the Lord Archbishop of, *Bishopthorpe, York.*
- Yorke, E. C., *New College, Oxford.*
- Yorke, V. W., 9-13, *George St., Manchester Square, W. 1.*
- †Young, Miss A. M., *Huguenot University College, Wellington, Cape Province, S. Africa.*
- Young, Miss E. L., *Queen Ethelburga's School, Harrogate.*
- Young, George M., *The Old Ovyard, Oare, Marlborough, Wilts.*
- Young, Gerard M., C.I.E., 3, *Lymington Road, N.W. 6.*
- Zahn, Prof. Dr. R., *Cranachstrasse 20, Berlin-Friedenau, Germany.*
- Zilliacus, Prof. Dr. E., *Slottsgatan 2A, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- Zimmern, Prof. Sir Alfred, 149, *Banbury Road, Oxford.*

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS

† Copyright Library.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

- ABERDEEN, St. Margaret's School for Girls.
Albyn Place, Aberdeen.
 ABERYSTWYTH, University College of Wales.
 †National Library of Wales.
 BIRMINGHAM, Public Libraries.
 King Edward VI School.
 The University, *Edmund Street.*
 BLOXHAM, The School, *near Banbury.*
 BRADFORD, Free Library and Art Museum,
Darley Street.
 The Grammar School.
 BRIGHTON, The Public Library.
 BRISTOL, The Grammar School.
 Badminton School, *Westbury-on-Trym.*
 Clifton College, *Clifton.*
 The University.
 BURY, LANCs., The Grammar School.
 CAMBRIDGE, Classical Faculty Library.
 Museum of Classical Archaeology.
 Newnham College.
 St. John's College.
 Sidney Sussex College.
 Trinity College.
 †The University Library.
 CANTERBURY, Simon Langton Schools.
 CARDIFF, University College of South Wales.
 CHARTERHOUSE, Charterhouse School, *Godalming.*
 CHELTENHAM, The Ladies' College.
 CROSBY, Merchant Taylors School, *Liverpool.*
 DUBLIN, The King's Inn Library.
 National Library of Ireland.
 Royal Irish Academy.
 †Trinity College.
 DUNDEE, The Albert Institute.
 DURHAM, St. Chad's College.
 St. Mary's College.
 The University.
 †EDINBURGH, National Library of Scotland.
 The Public Libraries, *George Fourth Bridge.*
 ENGLEFIELD GREEN, Royal Holloway College,
Surrey.
 ETON, Eton College, *Windsor.*
 GALWAY, The University.
 GLASGOW, Baillie's Institution, 153, *West Regent*
Street.
 The Mitchell Library, *North Street.*
 The University.
 GRAVESEND, The County School for Girls.
 HARROW, The School.
 HAWARDEN, St. Deiniol's Library, *near Chester.*
 HAYES, KENT, Hayes Court School.
 HERTFORD, Christ's Hospital School for Girls.
 HULL, The Public Libraries.
 Hymer's College.
 University College.
 LEEDS, The Leeds Library, *Commercial Street.*
 The Public Library.
 LIVERPOOL, The University.
 The Public Libraries, *William Brown Street.*
 LONDON, Alleyn's School, *Dulwich, S.E.* 21.
 The Athenæum Club, *W.* 1.
 Birkbeck College, *E.C.* 4.
 †British Museum, *W.C.* 1.
 British Museum, *W.C.* 1. Dept. of Printed
 Books.
 Cardinal Vaughan School, *W.* 14.
 Dulwich College, *S.E.* 21.
 King's College, *W.C.* 2.
 London Library, *S.W.* 1.
 North London Collegiate School, *N.W.* 5.
 Queen Mary College, *E.* 1.
 The Reform Club, *S.W.* 1.
 Royal Institution, *W.* 1.
 St. Paul's School, *West Kensington.*
 Sion College, *Victoria Embankment, E.C.* 4.
 Society of Antiquaries, *W.* 1.
 University of London, *W.C.* 1.
 Victoria and Albert Museum, *S.W.* 7.
 Westminster Public Libraries, *S.W.* 1.
 Westminster School, *S.W.* 1.
 Dr. Williams' Library, 14, *Gordon Square,*
W.C. 1.
 MANCHESTER, John Rylands Library.
 Lancashire Independent College.
 Victoria University.
 NEWBURY, Newbury Grammar School, *Berks.*
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, King's College.
 The Public Library.
 NOTTINGHAM, University College.
 OUNDLE, Oundle School, *Northants.*
 OXFORD, All Souls College.
 Ashmolean Museum (Dept. of Classical
 Archaeology).
 Balliol College.
 †The Bodleian Library.
 Brasenose College.
 Champion Hall.
 Christ Church.

OXFORD (*continued*.)

The Senior Library, Corpus Christi College.
 Exeter College.
 Hertford College.
 Meyrick Library, Jesus College.
 Keble College.
 Lady Margaret Hall.
 Lincoln College.
 Magdalen College.
 New College.
 Oriel College.
 The Queen's College.
 St. John's College.
 Somerville College.
 Trinity College.
 The Union Society.
 University College.
 Worcester College.
 PLYMOUTH, The Free Library.
 PRESTON, The Park School.
 The Public Library and Museum.
 READING, The University.
 RUGBY, The School.
 ST. ANDREWS, University Hall of Residence for
 Women Students.
 The University.
 SEDBERGH, The School, *Yorks*.
 SHEFFIELD, King Edward VII School.
 Public Libraries.
 University Library.
 SOUTHAMPTON, University College.
 STRATTON-ON-FOSSE, Downside School, *near*
Bath.
 SWANSEA, University College.
 UPPINGHAM, Uppingham School, *Rutland*.
 WINCHESTER, The College.
 YORK, St. Peter's School.

IMPERIAL.

ADELAIDE, The University, *S. Australia*.
 ANNAMALAINAGAR, Annamalai University, *S.*
India.
 AUCKLAND, University College, *New Zealand*.
 BRISBANE, University of Queensland.
 CAPE TOWN, J. W. Jagger Library, The Uni-
 versity.
 CARLTON, Trinity College, *Victoria, Australia*.
 CHRISTCHURCH, Canterbury University College,
New Zealand.
 COLOMBO, Ceylon University College.
 DUNEDIN, University of Otago, *New Zealand*.
 GRAHAMSTOWN, Rhodes University College, *S.*
Africa.
 HALIFAX, Dalhousie University, *Nova Scotia*.
 HAMMILTON, McMaster University, *Ontario*.
 HOBART, University of Tasmania.

JOHANNESBURG, Public Library, *Kerk Street*.
 Witwatersrand University.
 KINGSTON, Queen's University, *Ontario*.
 LONDON, Western University, *Ontario*.
 MELBOURNE, Public Library of Victoria,
Australia.
 The University, *Australia*.
 MONTREAL, Redpath Library, McGill Uni-
 versity, *Canada*.
 NICOSIA, Phaneromeni Library, *Cyprus*.
 PRETORIA, The University, *S. Africa*.
 SASKATOON, The University of Saskatchewan,
Canada.
 STELLENBOSCH, The University, *S. Africa*.
 SYDNEY, Public Library, *New South Wales*.
 The University, *New South Wales*.
 TORONTO, The University, *Ontario*.
 VANCOUVER, University of British Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ALBANY, N.Y., New York State Library.
 ALLIANCE, OHIO, Mount Union College.
 AMHERST, Mass., Amherst College.
 ANDOVER, MASS., Phillip's Academy, Brechin
 Hall.
 ANN ARBOR, MICH., General Library, The
 University of Michigan.
 APPLETON, WISC., Lawrence College.
 ATHENS, GA., University of Georgia.
 AURORA, N.Y., Wells College.
 AUSTIN, TEXAS, University of Texas.
 BALTIMORE, MD., Notre Dame College.
 Peabody Institute.
 BETHLEHEM, PA., Lehigh University.
 BLOOMINGTON, IND., Indiana University.
 BOSTON, MASS., The Boston Athenaeum.
 Museum of Fine Arts.
 The Public Library.
 BOULDER, COLO., University of Colorado.
 BROOKLYN, N.Y., Institute of Arts and Sciences.
 The Public Library.
 BRUNSWICK, MAINE, Bowdoin College.
 BRYN MAWR, MASS., Bryn Mawr College.
 BURLINGTON, VT., University of Vermont.
 CARLISLE, PA., Dickinson College.
 CARPINTERIA, CAL., Santa Barbara School.
 CHAMBERSBURG, PA., John Stewart Memorial
 Library, Wilson College.
 CHAPEL HILL, N.C., University of North
 Carolina.
 CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., Alderman Library.
 University of Virginia.
 CHESTER, PA., Bucknell Library.
 CHICAGO, ILL., Newberry Library.
 Ryerson Library, Art Institute of Chicago.
 CINCINNATI, OHIO, The University.

- CLEVELAND, OHIO, John Carroll University.
Public Library.
Museum of Art.
Western Reserve University.
- CLINTON, N.Y., Hamilton College.
- COLORADO SPRINGS, Coburn Library.
- COLUMBIA, MO., University of Missouri.
- COLUMBUS, OHIO, Ohio State University.
- DUBUQUE, IOWA, Columbia College, *14th and Alta Vista Streets*.
- DURHAM, N.C., Duke University.
- EUGENE, ORE., University of Oregon.
- GEORGETOWN, WASHINGTON, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Collection.
- GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., Public Library.
- GREENCASTLE, IND., De Pauw University.
- GRINNELL, IOWA, Grinnell College.
- HAMILTON, N.Y., Colgate University.
- HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE, Dartmouth College.
- HARTFORD, CONN., Case Memorial Library.
Trinity College.
- HAVERFORD, PA., Haverford College.
- HOUSTON, TEXAS, Rice Institute.
- INDIANAPOLIS, IND., Butler University.
- IOWA CITY, IOWA, State University.
- ITHACA, N.Y., Cornell University.
- JERSEY CITY, N.J., Free Public Library.
- KENT, OHIO, Kent State University.
- KNOXVILLE, TENN., University of Tennessee.
- LAWRENCE, KANSAS, University of Kansas.
- LINCOLN, NEB., University of Nebraska.
- LOS ANGELES, CAL., University of California,
405 Hilgard Avenue.
University of Southern California, *University Park*.
- LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY, University of Louisville.
- LYNCHBURG, VA., Randolph-Macon Women's College.
- MADISON, N.J., Drew University.
- MADISON, WISC., University of Wisconsin.
- MIDDLETOWN, CONN., Wesleyan University.
- MILLS COLLEGE, PA., Margaret Carnegie Library.
- MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., Minnesota University.
- MISSOULA, MONT., University of Montana.
- MORGANTOWN, W. VA., West Virginia University.
- NEW HAVEN, CONN., Yale University.
- NEW LONDON, CONN., Connecticut College.
- NEW YORK, College of the Sacred Heart,
Convent Avenue and 133rd Street.
Columbia University.
Fordham University.
Hunter College.
Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Public Library.
University Library, *University Heights*.
Washington Square Library, New York University, *100, Washington Square East*.
- NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, University of Oklahoma.
- NORTHAMPTON, MASS., Smith College.
- NORTON, MASS., Wheaton College.
- OBERLIN, OHIO, Oberlin College.
- OMAHA, NEB., Creighton University, *25th and California Streets*.
- OXFORD, OHIO, Miami University.
Western College.
- PHILADELPHIA, PA., The Free Library.
Museum of the University, *33rd and Spruce Streets*.
Temple University.
- PITTSBURG, PA., Carnegie Library.
- PORTLAND, ORE., The Library Association.
- POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., Vassar College.
- PRINCETON, N.J., Princeton University.
- PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND, Brown University.
- REDLANDS, CAL., University of Redlands.
- RIPON, WISC., The Lane Library, Ripon College.
- ROCHESTER, N.Y., Ambrose Swasey Library.
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.
University of Rochester.
- SACRAMENTO, CAL., California State Library.
- ST. LOUIS, MO., Washington University.
- SCHENECTADY, N.Y., Union College.
- SEATTLE, WASH., University of Washington.
- SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., Mount Holyoke College.
- STANFORD, CAL., Stanford University.
- SUPERIOR, WISC., State Teachers College.
- SWARTHMORE, PA., Swarthmore College.
- SWEET BRIAR, VA., Sweet Briar College.
- SYRACUSE, N.Y., Syracuse University.
- URBANA, ILL., University of Illinois.
- WASHINGTON, D.C., Catholic University of America.
Library of Congress.
- WELLESLEY, MASS., Wellesley College.
- WERNERSVILLE, PA., Jesuit Novitiate.
- WILLIAMSBURG, VA., College of William and Mary.
- WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., Williams College.
- WOOSTER, OHIO, Wooster College.
- WORCESTER, MASS., Holy Cross College.

BELGIUM.

BRUSSELS, Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire,
Parc du Cinquantenaire.

CHINA.

PEIPING, National Library, *Kiuming, Yunnan*.

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA.

PRAGUE, Archaeologisches Institut der Deutschen Universität.
Public and University Library.

DENMARK.

COPENHAGEN, Universitetets archaeologiske Laboratorium, *Ny Vestergade 10*.
Det Kongelige Bibliothek.

ECUADOR.

QUITO, Colegio Loyola, *Apartado 160, Cotacollao.*

EGYPT.

CAIRO, Egyptian Library, *Midan bab el Khalq.*
Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

FINLAND.

ÅBO, Åbo University.

FRANCE.

BEAULIEU-SUR-MER, Bibliothèque de la Villa
Kerylos, *Beaulieu-sur-mer*, A. M.

DJON, L'Université.

GRENOBLE, Bibliothèque de l'Université.

LILLE, L'Université, *Place Georges Lyon.*

LYON, Institut d'Archéologie Classique de
l'Université, 15 *Quai Claude Bernard.*

MONTPELIER, L'Université.

NANCY, Institut d'Archéologie de l'Université.

PARIS, L'École Normale Supérieure, 45, *Rue
d'Ulm.*

Bibliothèque des Musées Nationaux au Palais
du Louvre.

Bibliothèque de l'Université à la Sorbonne.

RENNES, Bibliothèque de l'Université.

STRASBOURG, Bibliothèque Nationale et Uni-
versitaire.

TOULOUSE, L'Université.

YZEURE (ALLIER), Bibliothèque du Scolasticat.

GERMANY.

BERLIN, Preussische Staatsbibliothek.

Staatliche Universitäts-Bibliothek.

Bibliothek der Staatlichen Museen.

FREIBURG I. BR., Universitätsbibliothek.

GOTTINGEN, Universitätsbibliothek.

GRAZ, Archäologisches Institut der Universität.

GREIFSWALD, Universitätsbibliothek.

HAMBURG, Bibliothek der Freien und Hansestadt
Hamburg.

KÖLN-LINDENTHAL, Archäologisches Institut
der Universität, *Langemarkplatz.*

ROSTOCK, Universitätsbibliothek.

TUBINGEN, Archäologisches Institut der Univer-
sität, *Wilhelmstrasse 9.*

VIENNA, Archäologisch-epigraphisches Seminar
der Universität.

WURZBURG, Martin von Wagner Museum der
Universität, *Domerschulgasse 16.*

HOLLAND.

UTRECHT, Bibliotheek der Universiteit.

ITALY.

CAGLIARI (SARDINIA), Facoltà di Lettere e
Filosofia, R. Università.

CITTÀ DEL VATICANO, Biblioteca Apostolica
Vaticana.

MILAN, Gabinetto di Archeologia, R. Uni-
versità, 10, *Corso Roma.*

PAVIA, Gabinetto di Archeologia dell' Uni-
versità.

ROME, R. Istituto di Archeologia e Storia dell'
Arte, *Piazza Venezia 3.*

NORWAY.

OSLO, Universitetsbiblioteket.

POLAND.

KRAKOW, Zakład Archeologii Klasycznej, *Ul.
Sw. Anny 1.*

SWEDEN.

GÖTEBORG, Stadsbibliotek.

LUND, Universitets-Bibliotek.

UPPSALA, Kungl. Universitetets Bibliotek.

SWITZERLAND.

FRIBOURG, Bibliothèque Cantonale et Universi-
taire.

GENEVA, Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire.

LAUSANNE, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des
Lettres.

NEUCHÂTEL, Bibliothèque Publique.

ZÜRICH, Zentralbibliothek.

EXCHANGES OF PUBLICATIONS

The following is a list of Editors, Societies, Institutions etc. with which exchanges have been arranged:—

GREAT BRITAIN.

- CAMBRIDGE: Cambridge Philological Society,
Museum of Classical Archaeology, Little St. Mary's Lane.
- LEEDS: Philosophical and Literary Society, *c/o The University Library.*
- LIVERPOOL: Institute of Archaeology, 11, *Abercromby Square.*
- LONDON: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, *c/o The Institute of Archaeology, Regent's Park, N.W. 1.*
- Egypt Exploration Society, 2, *Hinde Street, Manchester Square, W. 1.*
- Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, *Bedford Square, W.C. 1.*
- Royal Institute of British Architects, 66, *Portland Place, W. 1.*
- Royal Numismatic Society, 21, *Bedford Square, W.C. 1.*

IMPERIAL.

- CYPRUS: Department of Antiquities, *Nicosia.*
- INDIA: Director General of Archaeology, *Simla.*
Government Museum and Connemara Public Library, *Egmore, Madras.*

AMERICA.

- BALTIMORE, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University.
- BERKELEY, CAL.: University of California.
- CAMBRIDGE, MASS.: Dr. S. B. Luce, *Fogg Art Museum.*
Widener Library, *Harvard University.*
Divinity School Library, *Andover Hall, Harvard University.*
- CHICAGO, ILL.: Prof. W. Jaeger, 4554, *Greenwood Avenue.*
University of Chicago Library.
- NEW YORK: American Numismatic Society,
Broadway between 155th and 156th Street.
Prof. C. J. Kraemer, *New York University.*
Metropolitan Museum of Art.

BELGIUM.

- BRUSSELS: Prof. H. Grégoire, 45, *Rue des Bollandistes.*
Société des Bollandistes, 22, *Boulevard Saint Michel.*
- LOUVAIN: Abbé A. Rome, 150, *Avenue des Alliés.*

BULGARIA.

- SOFIA: Institut Archéologique Bulgare, 139 *Rue Rakowska.*

EGYPT.

- ALEXANDRIA: Société Archéologique.
- CAIRO: Musée du Caire.

ESTONIA.

- TARTU: Universitätsbibliothek.

FRANCE.

- BORDEAUX: Faculté des Lettres à l'Université.
- MONACO: M. Charles Vellay, 4, *Chemin de la Turbie.*
- PARIS: Académie des Beaux Arts, 23, *Quai Conti, VI.*
Association Guillaume Budé, 95, *Boulevard Raspail, VI.*
Association pour l'encouragement des Études Grecques, 14, *Rue Paul Déroulède, Bois-Colombes (Seine).*
Bibliothèque d'Art et d'Archéologie, 3, *Rue Michelet, VI.*
Bibliothèque Nationale.
Gazette des Beaux Arts, 140, *Faubourg Saint-Honore, VIII.*
Revue Archéologique, 108, *Boulevard Saint-Germain, VI.*
M. Léon Rey, 11, *Rue Galilée, XVI.*

GERMANY.

- BERLIN: Archäologisches Institut des Deutschen Reiches, *Mainstrasse 1, W 62.*
Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch, *Unter den Linden 8, NW 7.*
Dr. E. F. Weidner, *Oranienburgerstr. 52, Frohnau.*
- FRANKFURT: J. D. Sauerlanders Verlag.
- INNSBRUCK: Prof. Dr. F. Miltner, *Brennerstr. 15.*
- KIEL: Prof. Dr. R. Harder, *Friessenstr. 15.*
- LEIPSIK: Prof. Dr. H. Berve, *Ludolf Colditzstr. 14, O. 27.*
Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, *Salomonstr. 16.*
Verlag O. R. Riesland, *Carlstr., 20.*
Verlag B. G. Teubner, *C. 1.*
- VIENNA: Anthropologische Gesellschaft, *Burgring 7.*
Prof. Dr. Kretschmer, *Floriangasse 23.*
Oesterreichisches Archäologisches Institut, *Liebiggasse 5.*

GREECE.

ATHENS: Académie d'Athènes.
 American School of Classical Studies.
 Prof. Dr. N. A. Bees, 16, *Rue Aieroff*.
 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1, *Rue Pheidias*.
 École française d'Athènes.
 Ἑταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν.
 Ἑταιρεία Ἱστορικῶν Μελετῶν.
 Reale Scuola Italiana.
 Section archéologique, Ministère de l'Enseignement.
 Société archéologique d'Athènes.
 THESSALONIKA: Λαογραφικὸν Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου.

HOLLAND.

THE HAGUE: International Exchange Bureau.
Royal Library.
 NIJMEGEN: Prof. Dr. E. Drerup, *St. Anna Straat* 93.

HUNGARY.

BUDAPEST: Magyar Nemzeti Muzéum, *Regeszeti Osztaly*.

ITALY.

BOLOGNA: R. Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto, *Via Zamboni* 33.
 FLORENCE: Comitato permanente per l'Etruria, *Via della Pergola* 13.
 ROME: Accademia di Romania, *Valle Giulia*.
 American Academy, *Porta S. Pancrazio*.
 Antichità e Belle Arti del Governatorato, *Via del Portico d'Ottavia*.
 British School, *Valle Giulia*.
 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, *Via Sallustiana* 79.
 Direzione generale dell'Antichità e Belle Arti, *Ministero dell'Educazione Nazionale*.
 École française de Rome, *Palazzo Farnese*.
 Prof. R. Pettazzoni, *Via Crescenzo* 63.
 R. Accademia dei Lincei.
 Dott. U. Zanotti-Bianco, *Palazzo Taverna*, *Via Monte Giordano* 36.

RHODES: Instituto Storico-archeologico.

SYRACUSE: Instituto nazionale del dramma antico, *Via Gelone*, 22.

JUGOSLAVIA.

BELGRADE: Institut Balkanique, *Knez Mihajlova* 17.

PALESTINE.

JERUSALEM: British School of Archaeology, *P.O. Box* 357.
 Convent dominicain de S. Étienne, *P.O. Box* 178.
 Department of Antiquities, *P.O. Box* 586.

POLAND.

Lwów: Prof. W. Gruzewski, *Unwersytet*.

ROUMANIA.

BUCHAREST: Musée national des Antiquités, *Rue Victor Emmanuel III*, No. 11.

SWEDEN.

STOCKHOLM: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.

SYRIA.

BEIRUT: American University.
 Haut Commissariat.
 Université de S. Joseph.
 DAMASCUS: Institut français de Damas, *Palais Azem*.

TURKEY.

ISTANBUL: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, *Taksim Sira Selvi*, 100.

U.S.S.R.

LENINGRAD: Académie d'état pour l'histoire de la Culture matérielle, *Palais de Marbre, Quai du Neuf Janvier* 6.
 MOSCOW: Vestnik Drevney Istorii, *Krasnaya pl.*

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

50 BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

REPORT FOR THE SESSION 1937-38.

THE Council beg leave to submit their report for the Session now concluded :—

Finance.

Despite the drop of £112 in income and the expenditure of £139 on repairs and painting at 50 Bedford Square, the year ended with a credit balance of £314, which being transferred to the balance sheet brings the surplus up to £627.

In some ways this is a satisfactory result, and the financial position of the Society is definitely stronger than it was a few years ago when the balance sheet showed a deficit; but at the same time it is essential to realise that this improvement is mainly the result of limiting expenditure. The decrease in revenue is a serious matter, but being partly due to lower membership, it is a problem which each member of the Society can help to solve by obtaining new members. There is also a falling off in the receipts from donations, which in the past have been a visible expression of the generous support given to the Society by members and others.

Subscriptions from Student Associates, who have now become the main source of new members, have improved, but it must be borne in mind that Student Associates are almost a financial liability instead of an asset during the time that they enjoy the privileges of their status. It is only when they become full members (as the majority do ultimately) that the Society derives financial benefit. The need for new members outside the Student Associates is therefore all the more urgent, in order to replace those who at the end of each financial year are lost through death or resignation.

Every year it is becoming more obvious that if real progress is to be made, the Society must make its work appeal to the larger public which knows little Latin and less Greek.

The following figures show the membership at June 1st for the last three years :—

	Members	Life Members	Student Associates	Libraries	Total
1936	1,088	150	202	310	1,750
1937	1,052	150	230	307	1,739
1938	1,023	149	253	321	1,746

The Council has decided to reduce the price of *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*, in order

to bring this important record of the work of the British School at Athens within the reach of all. The revised price for members is £1 instead of £2 12s. 6d.

Obituary.

By the death of Emmanuel Loewy on Feb. 11th of this year, the Hellenic Society has lost an Honorary Member of great distinction. He was aged 81, and during his long life had received almost every honour that the learned world has to offer. The beginnings were not easy. Though his record as student in the University of his native Vienna was brilliant, the disabilities attaching to a Jewish origin debarred him from a professorial career in Austria; yet his merits could not long be overlooked, and in 1881-1882 he took part in the Austrian expeditions to Lycia and Caria which, conducted by Benndorf, Niemann and Petersen, resulted in securing for the Vienna Museum the magnificent series of reliefs from the 'Heroon' of Gjoelbaschi-Trysa. Loewy helped to draw up the report of the expeditions, and in later years made good use of the rich material, which Gjoelbaschi had revealed, in his reconstruction of Greek pictorial art. In 1885, when only 28, he published his *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer*, which remains of fundamental importance for the chronology of Greek sculpture. The collection of some 560 inscriptions was laborious enough, but the great value of the book lies in the accompanying commentaries. Numerous papers on the inscriptions of Gjoelbaschi, of Rhodes, of Mughla in Caria, show him to have been an accomplished epigraphist.

The turning-point in his career came in 1899, when he was elected in open international competition to the newly created chair of classical archaeology in the University of Rome.

The choice of Loewy proved admirable. He at once set himself to master the Italian language, which he learned to speak and write with perfect ease; thus well equipped and a born teacher, he threw himself whole-heartedly into the business of creating a school of archaeology which he soon raised to the first rank. The task before him was arduous: an archaeological library, a collection of slides, a museum of casts had all to be called into being. To the casts Loewy

devoted special attention, selecting and arranging them from the first on strictly scientific lines. The collection was long lodged in a sort of barn in the Via della Marmorata, which disappeared in the course of modern building operations: after various migrations it is at last worthily housed in the spacious galleries of the new University buildings. It must have afforded satisfaction to so ardent a Hellenist as Loewy to learn that the collection formed by him to illustrate Greek art is now restricted to its original purpose, the sister collection of Roman casts, soon to be enormously enriched by specimens brought together for the Augustan Exhibition, having its own *habitat* in the Museo dell'Impero near the Circus Maximus.

Loewy excelled as a professor: undeterred by the austerity of his method, students flocked to his lectures, and found additional attraction in the genuine interest with which he watched their progress and the trouble he took for their advancement. It is not too much to say that the generation of younger Italian scholars who as professors, museum directors and excavators in Italy and outside have helped to raise Italian archaeology to its present high level, are largely indebted to Loewy for their scientific formation. In the midst of these manifold occupations he found time for considerable literary activity. Among the more notable of the publications (sixty in number) belonging to the years of his Roman professorship, must be reckoned the little volume (*The Rendering of Nature in Early Greek Art*, 1907) in which he 'traced the course of artistic conception of form from the primitive period to a period of greater freedom.' It was the sequel to an earlier monograph (*Lysipp und seine Stellung in der griechischen Plastik*, 1891) dealing with the same problem of the relation between objects as seen in nature and as rendered in art. To his Roman period also belongs his masterly *Die griechische Plastik*.

Italy declared war on Austria on May 24th, 1915. On the 22nd Loewy had been expected to attend an important University committee, but failed to appear. On enquiry it was discovered that he had left secretly some days previously, taking leave of no one, fleeing from the storm which he knew to be imminent. He was never in Rome again, though often urged to revisit it. It was characteristic of the man and of his perfect loyalty that during those troubled months he steadily refused to acquire the Italian citizenship which, as he well knew, would have been readily granted to him. Austrian he was born and Austrian he would die. Though Vienna offered him a sure refuge, the University was still subject to regulations that made it difficult or impossible to offer him a

regular professorship, but in 1917 a post of *extraordinarius* was specially created for him which he held until his retirement in 1927. After his return to Austria his literary activity continued unabated. On the occasion of his seventieth birthday in 1927 his colleagues, pupils and a large circle of friends united to offer him an etched portrait of himself accompanied by the list of his 102 publications up to that date. In 1937 a second list was brought out of thirty-two additional publications in the last ten years—an amazing output for a man of his age. One of the books by which he will be best remembered is his *Polygnot* (1927), the summary as it were of his long and penetrating study of Greek vase-paintings and of Greek sculpture in relief. Like the majority of the archaeologists of his generation, Loewy began by seeking salvation in Greek art alone, but as time went on his sympathies expanded, and he came to devote increasing attention to the art of Rome, among excellent contributions to the subject being papers on Roman sculpture in relief, on the origins of the Roman triumphal arch, on the Ara Pacis and similar topics.

Professor Percy Gardner, one of the founders of the Society, has passed away in his ninety-first year. For sixteen years he was Editor of the *Journal* and from 1905 to 1909 President of the Society. He was still keenly interested in the studies for which he had done so much in the Coin Room of the British Museum, as Disney Professor at Cambridge, and from 1887 to 1925 as Lincoln and Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology and Art at Oxford. Here he reorganised the 'Arundel Marbles,' created a teaching department and reference library, and continued to publish work such as the *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, the *Catalogue of the Ashmolean Vases*, and *Sculptured Tombs of Hellas*, as well as the *Principles of Greek Art* and studies of early Christian thought, which interested him profoundly. Both lines of enquiry converged in the *Principles of Christian Art*. His high ideals of scholarship and academic training inspired a distinguished sequence of pupils, and slowly but perceptibly modified the outlook of Oxford humanists on archaeological discoveries. A legacy of £200 was left to the Society under his will.

The Society has lost one of its Life-Members by the death of Mr. C. C. Edgar, a scholar who had done much work of high value in various branches of classical learning. His earlier publications were in the sphere of archaeology. Besides contributions to periodicals he was the author of seven volumes in the *Catalogue Général* of the Cairo Museum, relating to objects of the Graeco-Roman period, sculptures, glass, vases,

bronzes, coffins, portraits, and the like. The acquisition of a large portion of the great archive of papyrus documents found at Darb el-Gerza (Philadelphia), known throughout the world as the Zenon Papyri, led him to turn his attention to papyrology: and henceforth it was to that field that his main activity was directed. His edition, in four large volumes of the *Catalogue Général*, of the Zenon papyri at Cairo ranks as one of the most important and most masterly editions of papyrus texts in existence. He also contributed, in collaboration with the late Prof. Hunt, two volumes of *Select Papyri* to the Loeb series, and at the time of his death he had nearly completed the task of editing Part ii of Vol. III of the *Tebtunis Papyri*, which he took over on Hunt's death. His death is a grievous loss to papyrological studies.

The death of Mr. G. McNeil Rushforth on March 26th, at the age of seventy-five, robbed the Society of one who had been a member for almost twenty years and who to the close of his life retained a keen interest in classical studies, though his own contributions to learning lay increasingly in the field of medieval art and architecture. There, indeed, he has left work of lasting value, not only in his English version of Rivoira's masterly *Lombardic Architecture* (1910, 1926), his *Medieval Christian Imagery* (1936), and numerous papers marked by great learning, keen observation and sensitive appreciation, but also in his treatment of the ancient glass in Malvern Priory Church and Tewkesbury Abbey. To classical scholars his name is familiar as that of the first Director of the British School at Rome, the editor of a valuable selection of *Latin Historical Inscriptions* (1893), of which a second edition appeared in 1930, and the author of the essay on Roman Art in *The Legacy of Rome*. His achievement is the more remarkable in view of his constant ill-health, a burden which he bore with unflinching patience and courage. By his death the study of medieval art has lost one of its foremost exponents in this country, and a large circle of friends a man of singular charm.

William Douglas Caroe, who died in Cyprus at the age of 80 on February 25th, was an architect of distinction. A large part of his work consisted in the repair and rescue from neglect and decay of medieval buildings, which he carried out with great structural insight and ingenuity. He also built churches and designed memorials and other fittings in many parts of England. In the course of his practice he was confronted with a large variety of structural and archaeological problems, which his profound knowledge of building methods enabled him to solve. His comprehensive memory, aided by

his power of sketching, gave him an almost encyclopaedic knowledge of medieval buildings and building lore, which he was always ready to share with his brother architects.

His vitality remained with him to the end of his life, and only a few years before his death he built himself a winter home in Cyprus, where he took pleasure in supervising the native workmen and teaching them the practical details of plumbing and drain-laying, accomplishments which have received but scanty attention in Mediterranean countries, but of which, as of all else connected with his profession, Caroe was a master. In his Cambridge days he stroked the First Trinity boat for two years. Slight and spare of build, he possessed remarkable and enduring vigour of body and mind.

Professor W. J. Woodhouse, after a distinguished career at the Queen's College, Oxford, was one of the earlier Craven University Fellows and, after publishing the results of wide travels in Aetolia, became Professor of Greek in the University of Sydney, where he created a vigorous school of classical studies. A recent pupil writes:—'He was a fount of inspiration to those who would otherwise have dwelt far from the springs of living water. His enthusiasm for "matters of fact," lit by the scholar's insight, created and re-peopled the Greek world. The day which brought news of his death was deeply shadowed with loss.'

Miss Janet Case is probably remembered most widely as the one woman who has acted in a Cambridge Greek play, having taken the part of Athena in the *Eumenides* in 1885. For many years she was a devoted and effectual promoter of Hellenic studies, and imparted something of her own love of the great Greek writers to many a pupil. Her pocket edition of *Prometheus Bound* is a delightful companion on a journey or in a garden.

The Society has also to record with regret the loss of the following:—Mr. J. Aston, Mr. R. S. Bate, Mrs. A. F. Buxton, Mr. F. E. Corley, Sir H. Hadow, Mr. C. R. Haines, Hon. Mrs. Henn, Mr. G. A. Hight, Rev. R. H. Law, Miss A. M. Lloyd, Rev. E. H. Polehampton, Mr. W. E. Riley, Mr. J. L. Stocks and Mr. R. F. Stratton.

Administration.

The Council take leave with regret of their retiring President, Professor J. L. Myres. They have much pleasure in nominating Sir Richard Livingstone, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, as his successor for the ensuing term of three years.

The following Members of Council retire under Rule 19: Mr. S. Casson, Mr. W. L. Cuttle, Mr. W. K. C. Guthrie, Miss W. Lamb,

Mr. D. L. Page, Prof. P. N. Ure, Mr. H. T. Wade-Gery, and Prof. E. H. Warmington.

The Council have nominated for election as Members of their body for the next three years: Mr. A. Andrewes, Mr. R. D. Barnett, Lady Brooke, Mr. R. M. Cook, Miss M. Hartley, Mr. C. M. Robertson, Mr. T. C. Skeat, Mr. G. A. D. Tait, Mr. A. D. Trendall and Mr. A. M. Woodward.

The Council have pleasure in announcing that Sir George Hill has been elected to the Standing Committee in place of Miss Alford, who retires by rotation.

With the publication of the first part of this year's *Journal*, Mr. F. N. Pryce retires from the Editorship, and the Society will support the Council's appreciation of the care and skill which he has given to this work, especially during the last few years, when the cost of the *Journal* has had to be limited. The Council are pleased to inform the Society that Mr. A. D. Trendall, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been appointed Editor, and will take up his duties in the near future.

As announced in the Council's previous Report, the Treasurer's Department has been transferred to the Society's headquarters in Bedford Square: the reorganisation necessitated by this change has been found to result in greater convenience and economy.

The Council again thank Mr. C. F. Clay and Mr. W. E. F. Macmillan for giving their services as Auditors for the past year, and have nominated them for re-election.

The Council desire to record their appreciation of the work of the Librarian and his staff throughout the Session.

Meetings.

The following communications have been made during the session:—

Nov. 2nd, 1937. Mr. J. Enoch Powell on 'Herodotus in the Making.'

Nov. 23rd, 1937. Prof. C. F. A. Schaeffer on 'Ras Shamra and the Aegean and Mycenaean World.'

Feb. 1st, 1938. Mr. A. W. Gomme on 'Aristophanes and Politics.'

May 3rd, 1938. Mr. R. M. Cook on 'The Date of the Hesiodic "Shield".'

June 28th, 1938. Prof. J. L. Myres 'Presidential Address' on 'Pre-Socratic History.'

Summaries of the above communications, where available, will appear in the Society's *Journal*.

The Joint Library.

The following figures show the work done during the last three sessions:—

Library.

	1935-6	1936-7	1937-8
Books added	516	579	405
Books Borrowed ...	4,706	4,353	4,741
Borrowers	683	685	603

Slide Collections, etc.

Slides added	170	178	171
Slides borrowed ...	7,015	4,714	6,685
Slides sold	459	512	461
Photographs sold...	143	182	85

The following are among the interesting accessions made during the year:—*Antioch on the Orontes*, vol. ii, Blegen's *Prosymna*, Jones's *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Naumann's *Der Quellbezirk von Nîmes*, *Altertümer von Pergamon*, vols. 9 and 10, Sir Aurel Stein's *Archaeological Reconnaissances in N.W. India and S.E. Iran*, the *Corolla Ludvig Curtius*, Powell's *Lexicon to Herodotus*, Altheim's *History of Roman Religion*, Wallace's *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, Klumbach's *Tarentiner Grabkunst*, the completion of Oswald's *Index of Figure-types on Terra Sigillata*, the first volume of Beyen's *Die Pompejanische Wanddekoration*, Der Nersessian's *L'illustration du roman de Baalam et Joasaph*, Talbot Rice's *The Icons of Cyprus*, the fourth and fifth parts of *Inscriptions de Délos*, the fifth volume of *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, an album of photographs of the Euripides palimpsest *Codex Hierosolymitanus* 1111 and the second volume of the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*, containing the *Hymnology of Athous*.

The following additional periodicals are now taken by the Library: *Ambix*, *Annali del Seminario giuridico della R. Università di Palermo*, *Publications du Service des Antiquités de Maroc*, *Revue historique du droit français et étranger*, and *Studi italiani di filologia classica*.

Through the kind donations of members and the National Central Library's scheme for the disposal of duplicates, the gaps in the set of *Archaeologia* are now practically filled.

Progress has also been made in the provision of additional copies of books much in demand by Student Associates, the cost being a first charge on the proceeds of the sale of books held last summer.

The Councils of the Hellenic and Roman Societies wish to express their thanks for gifts of books from the following:—

Authors: Dr. Sophie Abramowicz, Mr. M. A. Arnould, Dr. G. Bendinelli, Mr. E. Bielefeld, Mr. E. H. Blakeney, Prof. Campbell Bonner, Dr. D. Bosdas, H. E. M. D. Caclamanos, Prof. I. Cazzaniga, Prof. E. Ciccotti, Mr. C. K. Constantinidis, Dr. F. della Corte, Prof. F. Cumont, Mr. S. Delta, Prof. E. Diehl, Dr. G. Dimitrakos,

Dr. F. Dornseiff, Dr. N. L. Drabkin, Prof. L. Dretup, Dr. R. P. Eckels, Dr. P. Enk, Mr. A. Gitti, Dr. V. Gordziejew, Mr. H. Herzfelder, Mr. W. M. Hugill, Prof. S. Johnson, Mr. G. E. Kirk, Dr. E. D. Kolokotsas, Prof. L. Lacroix, Prof. M. A. Levi, Dr. E. Loewy, Mr. A. W. G. Lowther, Dr. R. de Maeyer, Prof. A. Maiuri, Dr. H. Markowski, Dr. E. von Mercklin, Mr. A. Minard, Honble. Mercy Money-Coutts, Dr. Jessie D. Newby, Prof. M. P. Nilsson, Dr. D. Norberg, Mr. O. E. Nybakken, Mr. P. N. Oikonomos, Mr. A. Oswald, Prof. F. Poulsen, Dr. A. Rini, Prof. G. Rodenwaldt, Miss D. M. Schullian, Mr. J. A. Spranger, Prof. P. J. Stacks, Dr. J. Staczuk, Sir Aurel Stein, Mrs. E. Strong, Dr. A. Svennson, Dr. P. Treves, Mr. D. Van Berchem, Dr. A. W. Van Buren, Dr. C. C. Van Essen, Prof. J. Whatmough, Mr. E. Wikén, Mrs. J. M. Woodward, Dr. Z. Zmigryder-Konopka.

Donors of other books: Miss M. Alford, Dr. St. Clair Baddeley, Dr. H. I. Bell, Lt.-Col. A. Botelho da Costa Veiga, Dr. W. H. Buckler, Mr. F. C. Hiley, Major Gordon Home, Prof. S. Lambrino, Prof. H. Last, Sir George Macdonald, Mr. H. Mattingly, Dr. W. Miller, Dr. J. G. Milne, Mr. W. T. Purdon, Miss M. V. Taylor, Mr. A. D. Trendall.

The Presses of the following Universities: Cambridge, Catholic University of America, Harvard, Manchester, Michigan, Oxford, Princeton, Virginia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan), Les Presses Universitaires de France.

Institutions and Associations: Akademie der Wissenschaften (Belgrade), Allard Pierson Stichting, American Geographical Society, Aquincum Museum (Budapest), Archäologisches Institut des Deutschen Reiches, athenische und istanbulische Abteilungen, Association Guillaume Budé, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, École des Hautes Études (Ghent), Guildhall Library, Hermitage Museum, Institut français de Damas, Institut für Münzkunde und Archäologie der P. Pázmány-Universität (Budapest), Manchester Museum, Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York), Musées d'Istanbul, Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire (Brussels), National Central Library, National Museum of Wales, New York University, Office international des Musées, Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana, Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Université de St. Joseph (Beirut), Université de Strasbourg, University College (London), University of Uppsala, Valletta Museum.

Publishing Houses: Allen & Unwin, Pierre André, E. Arnold, B. T. Batsford, C. H. Beck, 'Les Belles Lettres,' B. Blackwell, Bloud & Gay, E. de Boccard, A. W. Brøgger, Cassell & Co.,

H. Champion, Christophers, Didier & Richard, G. Einaudi, Elanders Boktryckerei, 'Ernst Plates' Riga, J. Feichtingers Erben, G. Gambino, P. Geuthner, W. de Gruyter, Gryphius-Verlag Reutlingen, S. Hirzel, Historical Research Publishing Co., Hodder & Stoughton, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, Jouve et Cie, Junker, Dunnhaupt, V. Klostermann, W. Kohlhammer, A. Kröner, E. Leroux, Levin & Munksgaard, Longmans Green, Macmillan & Co., Gebr. Mann, F. Meiner, Methuen, H. Milford, Munzhandlung Basel, Martinus Nijhoff, G. B. Paravia, H. J. Paris, Payot, 'Rinascimento del Libro,' L. Rohrscheid, G. C. Sansoni, A. Schroll, Stevens & Brown, Taylor & Francis, B. G. Teubner, G. Thone, A. Topelmann, K. Triltsch, Trimarchi, J. Vin, Weidmann, Wettergren & Kebers Forlag, Williams & Norgate, C. Winter, N. Zanichelli.

As before, the two Councils have to record their grateful appreciation of the help given by Mrs. Culley in dealing with the accessions of books and by Miss Alford in recording the inflow of periodicals.

The thanks of the Councils are due to the following donors to the photographic department: Mr. O. Davies, Mr. D. E. L. Haynes, Dr. J. D. Gilruth, Mr. T. B. Mitford, Mr. G. Peachey, Mr. F. N. Pryce, Mr. W. T. Purdon, Miss J. Reckitt, Prof. H. J. W. Tillyard, and the Royal Numismatic Society.

The Library has received a most acceptable gift of an electric clock from the former Librarian Mr. John Penoyre, to whom the Councils tender their gratitude.

Another interesting donation is that of a Tanagra statuette, the gift of Miss Alford, which will presently be on view in the Library.

A welcome improvement in the use made of the slide collection has taken place during the period under review, but the latest figures are still well below those of a few years past. In order to determine the causes of the decline and devise remedies, a questionnaire was addressed to those who had made use of the collection during the last few years. An analysis of the replies has confirmed the view that some of the sets need revision and that an up-to-date catalogue, even if abridged, would be very welcome. It has also shown that the epidiastroscope is becoming widely used as an alternative to the lantern, though the superiority of the latter is generally admitted. It is hoped in the course of the next session to effect the revision of a number of sets and other improvements to the main collection. The Councils desire to thank all those who have helped by their co-operation in answering the questionnaire and by making many interesting and valuable suggestions.

BALANCE SHEET.

Liabilities.

(Signed) C. F. CLAY.

C. F. CLAY,
W. E. F. MACMILLAN.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT. FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.

<i>Expenditure.</i>		<i>Income.</i>	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
To Salaries.....	492 5 0	By Members' Subscriptions—	
" Pension Insurance	33 3 8	Arrears	9 19 6
" Miscellaneous Expenses	72 14 0	1937	1162 7 3
" Stationery	26 9 2½		
" Postage	57 17 2½	Members' Entrance Fees	1172 6 9
" Sundry Printing, Rules, List of Members, Notices, &c.....	43 5 5	" Student Associates' Subscriptions	14 14 0
" Heating, Lighting, Cleaning, Maintenance of Library Premises, &c.	387 14 9½	" Libraries' Subscriptions—	128 1 0
" Insurance	22 7 6	Arrears	5 5 0
" Grants—		1937	330 13 7
British School at Athens	75 0 0		
" " Rome	5 5 0	Life Compositions brought into Revenue Account	335 18 7
" Balance from ' Journal of Hellenic Studies ' Account	80 5 0	Dividends on Investments	30 15 0
" Balance from Library Account	602 17 1	Contributed by the Society for Promotion of Roman Studies	116 13 10
		Sale of 'Antic Oculos'	275 0 0
		Sale of 'Artemis Orthia'	15 0
		Miscellaneous Receipts	9 12 6
		Donations towards current expenses	12 8 4
		" Balance from Lantern Slides and Photo- graphs Account	8 7 6
" Balance	314 7 7½	" Balance from Library Premises Account ...	30 15 10
			112 17 7
			<u>£2260 5 11</u>

Dr. 'JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES' ACCOUNT. FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937. Cr.

To Printing and Paper, Vol. LVII	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Plates	473	9	2				
" Drawing and Engraving	24	7	2				
" Editing and Reviews	38	19	9		133	17	9
" Packing, Addressing, and Carriage to Members	76	1	6		8	19	3
	149	17	11				
							142 17 0
							17 1 5
							602 17 1
							<u>£762 15 6</u>

LANTERN SLIDES AND PHOTOGRAPHS ACCOUNT. FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.


To Slides and Photographs for Sale.....	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
" Slides for Hire	14	10	2				
" Balance to Income and Expenditure Account	6	8	2				
	36	15	10				
							£55 18 2
							1 16 0
							<u>£57 14 2</u>

LIBRARY ACCOUNT. PURCHASES AND BINDING. FROM JANUARY 1, 1937, TO DECEMBER 31, 1937.

To Purchases	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Binding	60	1	8				
" Cost of printing Accessions Lists to the Library and Slides Departments, less contribution from the Roman Society	59	3	6				
	30	17	3				
							£23 3 1
							126 19 5
							<u>£150 2 5</u>

LIBRARY PREMISES ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1937.

To Rates	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Transferred from Balance Sheet—Proportion of Expenditure for Year	405	5	0				
Balance to Income and Expenditure Account	128	17	5				
	23	0	0				
	112	17	7				
							£20 0 0
							650 0 0
							<u>£670 0 0</u>





Scale 1 : 100.

N. Magn.

WALLS OF LEVEL 4
WALLS RESTORED







"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

S. B., 148. N. DELHI.